

THE REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW

No. 3.—JULY—1912.

I.

WILLIAM JAMES.

JOHN S. STAHR.

Professor Josiah Royce, of Harvard University, in delivering the oration before the Harvard chapter of the Phi Beta Kappa Society in June, 1911, said that America had, up to the present time, produced three men, and only three, who deserved to be called representative American philosophers. These are Jonathan Edwards, Ralph Waldo Emerson and William James. He defines a representative philosopher as "one who thinks for himself, fruitfully, with true independence, and with successful inventiveness, about problems of philosophy, and, at the same time, one who gives utterance to philosophical ideas which are characteristic of some stage and of some aspect of the spiritual life of his own people."¹ Accepting the definition thus given there is no room for doubt or hesitation in giving Professor James a place, and many think the first place, among those who stand forth as exponents and leaders of thought in the development of our national life. His versatility and broad scholarship, his keen insight and wide tolerance, his originality in thought and expression,

¹ *Harvard Graduates' Magazine*, September, 1911, page 1.

enabled him to master the prevailing systems of philosophy, to criticize them, and to formulate his own ideas with a force and clearness rarely found in philosophical literature. At the same time his temper and frame of mind led him continually to lay stress upon the concrete and practical and kept him thus in touch with what are popularly called the realities of our human experience; his ear was close to nature's throbbing heart, so that he heard the pulsations of life and the voices of struggling interests in the human soul as a poet or prophet, fully as much as a philosopher. In this way he was qualified in large measure to serve as the representative of American ideas, of the aspirations and longings of our national life, giving them definite form, and helping to shape them into a semblance to the ideals which he himself cherished and towards which, as he hoped and believed, the world was moving. His geniality and open-heartedness enabled him to see and appreciate the good in all forms of belief and doctrine, even in systems the most remote from his manner of thinking. He detested monism and the philosophy of the absolute, and yet he found good in it, even if it was only to give one occasionally a "moral holiday." He was thoroughly convinced of the absurdity of many of the claims of Christian Science, and yet he went before a committee of the legislature to testify in its behalf in certain aspects of its belief and practice.

He was exceedingly vigorous in thought and expression; particularly happy in the coining of terms and phrases, and in fact a master in the art of putting things in a form that could not fail to attract attention and awaken interest. He wrote philosophy, it has been said, as if it were fiction, while his brother Henry James, Jr., wrote fiction as if it were philosophy. In matter and form, therefore, his writings and lectures are to be reckoned with as giving an account of present-day thought in psychology and ethics, philosophy and religion.

William James was born in New York, January 14, 1842. His father was the Rev. Henry James, who graduated at Union College, studied theology at Princeton and in England.

He afterward embraced the theology and philosophy of Swedenborg, though he never joined the ecclesiastical organization known as the New Church. He accepted the dogma of the full deity of Jesus Christ, but differed from most of the orthodox churches in his view of the Trinity. It will thus be seen that William James's earlier religious associations were Christian, although he himself was never fully identified with the Christian church. We shall have occasion to refer to his attitude later on, but it is well to bear in mind in studying his life and teachings that, as he himself says, he got away from his early religious ideas in his scientific and philosophical studies and treated the question of religion purely from a philosophical point of view. Professor James was a student in the Lawrence Scientific School in Harvard from 1861 to 1863; later he studied medicine from 1863-65, accompanied the Thayer Expedition to Brazil 1865-66, and received the degree of M.D. at Harvard in 1869. He was instructor in physiology from 1872 to 1876, and of anatomy from 1873 to 1876. He was assistant professor of physiology from 1876 to 1880; assistant professor of philosophy from 1880 to 1885; professor of philosophy from 1885 to 1889; professor of psychology, 1889 to 1897; professor of philosophy, 1897 to 1907. He became emeritus professor in 1907, and continued such to the time of his death in August, 1910.

It will be seen thus that Professor James's interest and work lay largely in scientific and philosophical studies. The fact that he had studied medicine, that he was thoroughly conversant with anatomy and physiology and the various branches of biological science, was of great value in his psychological and philosophical studies. He devoted himself, of course, largely to the lines of work involved in the positions which he successively held as instructor and professor in Harvard University, but his influence and his labors were much more far-reaching. He was noted as a lecturer, and delivered courses in the leading universities in this country and in Europe, and he was a prolific writer, contributing largely to

the scientific and philosophical journals of the day. As examples of work done outside of his regular university courses we may refer to his "Talks to Teachers," the "Ingersoll Lectures on Immortality," the "Varieties of Religious Experience," the two books on "Pragmatism," and "What is Truth," and the essays on "The Will to Believe," the "Dilemma of Determinism," and "A Pluralistic Universe." The freshness and vigor of his thought, the charm of his style, and the geniality of spirit manifest in all these writings prove so attractive that one does not easily take up any one of them and lay it aside without following his train of thought to the end.

It is natural to speak of Professor James as the psychologist; perhaps his reputation as a scholar and thinker rests more especially upon his labors in this field; and yet it must be borne in mind that his philosophy, his view of the world, his spirit of work and inquiry in all departments of knowledge give tone and character to his labors in this field. He calls himself a "pragmatic realist"; sometimes a "radical empiricist." His critics charge him with a tendency to estimate things generally for their "cash value." It would be a great mistake, however, to suppose that in emphasizing the concrete and the practical, and insisting upon the fact that all truth is truth only as it looks to and has practical consequences, he means to deny the reality of moral ideas and standards of conduct, other and higher than those which you find in the business life of this practical age. He believes in higher ideals; he emphasizes moral responsibility; he stands with head uncovered in the presence of what men regard as supernatural realities; and yet he insists that we know these higher realities, we have use for these moral standards, we are sure of the meaning of things only as they become a matter of daily experience and guide us through the mazes of our earthly life to a better and brighter world which we ourselves must help to create.

There is probably no work on psychology extant in the English language or for that matter in any other language, that is

as fascinating and illuminating in its discussion of psychological problems as James's larger work in two volumes. This does not mean that his conclusions and theories are to be always accepted. In point of fact, Professor James does not by any means speak the last word on many of the topics discussed; but there is a clearness in the statement of different views, a keenness of criticism, an aptness of illustration, and a skill in argument which interest and instruct the student at the same time that they put the thinker upon his mettle and make him anxious to test and to follow out to the farthest limits the lines of thought laid down by the author.

The first thing we have to notice in this connection is the fact that James differs radically from Kant at the very outset in his theory of perception and conception. The older psychologists generally assume that we perceive first of all, individual things; we have single sensations which are combined and developed into percepts, and groups of percepts are made to reach their significance in the concept. James, on the other hand, insists that consciousness at first is not of single things. The primitive consciousness, as he describes it, is a "big, blooming, buzzing confusion." It is only gradually by the process of attention and dissociation that single things, sensations emerge out of this primeval chaos, and, in course of time, the percept, in which dwells all the fullness of reality, as we can know it, is developed. By the process of abstraction and generalization we form the concept, that is, we get a thought or an idea, which becomes a permanent thing for the mind. The percept undergoes changes, it appears, disappears, or changes, as the case may be, but the concept cannot vary or unfold or develop. The concept, therefore, is not that in which we find the fullest expression of reality, it is only a means or an instrument for the mind to work with, in order that it may carry on its higher processes of association—memory and thought. But the stress in James's thinking lies all the time upon the percept and the perceptual order, as that which has its full reality in the world of sense by which we are confronted.

The second peculiarity to which we may call attention is his theory of the ego, and of the consciousness of personal identity. After a keen criticism of the "mind-stuff" theory, that is, of a diffused universal consciousness throughout nature, of materialism, of associationism, and of transcendentalism, James finds that the core of consciousness is what he calls the "stream of thought." Mind, for him, is but another name for the succession of mental states, which are linked together by the passing thought, each one receiving from its predecessor the memory of the past and all that it involves. The difference between the thoughts of one distinct consciousness or ego, and another such ego, is found in the fact that there is a peculiar warmth, or sense of familiarity in what is my own, which does not pertain to that which is another's, and that when thoughts, that is, states of mind arise which have this peculiar warmth or sense of familiarity, I recognize them as my own, and taking this in connection with the ever-present sense of influences which come from the body and all its various forms of activity, we get, in that way, a personal identity which needs no spiritual agent or substantive mind apart from this stream of thought itself.

It may be said, of course, in criticism of this theory of personal identity, that thought necessarily requires a thinker, and that James's theory is, therefore, inadequate. It must be borne in mind, however, that his love for the real and concrete makes him reluctant to adopt, as a fact, anything that cannot be actually verified as a part of our experience. He does not deny that there may be such a thing as mind, or a spiritual ego, but he says all that we are conscious of is the passing thought, and that this is really all that is necessary to account for all the facts of consciousness with which the psychologist has to deal.

The most distinctive feature of James's psychology is his theory of the emotions, usually called the James-Lange theory, because it was propounded about the same time by James in this country and by Lange in Denmark and Germany.

James's own statement of the theory is as follows: "Our natural way of thinking about the coarser emotions is that the mental perception of some fact excites the mental affection called the emotion, and that the latter state of mind gives rise to the bodily expression. My theory, on the contrary, is that the bodily changes follow directly the perception of the exciting fact, and that our feeling of the same changes as they occur, is the emotion. Common sense says, we lose our fortune, are sorry and weep; we meet a bear, are frightened, and run; we are insulted by a rival, are angry and strike. The hypothesis here to be defended says that this order of sequence is incorrect; that the one mental state is not immediately induced by the other, that the bodily manifestations must first be interposed between and that the more rational statement is that we feel sorry because we cry, angry because we strike, afraid because we tremble, and not that we cry, strike, or tremble because we are sorry, angry, or fearful, as the case may be. Without the bodily states following on the perception, the latter would be purely cognitive in form, bare, colorless, destitute of emotional warmth. We might, then, see the bear and judge it best to run; receive the insult, and deem it right to strike; but we should not feel *afraid* or *angry*."² This is, of course, a crude and epigrammatical way of stating the theory, and we must not understand James to mean it in this literal way. He does insist, however, that the sensational and perceptual experience simply brings about a series of bodily changes, and that the feeling of the changes which thus take place in the body is really what we call the emotion. The main argument by which he supports the theory is this: "If we fancy some strong emotion, and then try to abstract from our consciousness of it all the feelings of its bodily symptoms, we find that we have nothing left behind; no mind stuff, out of which the emotion can be constituted, and that a cold and neutral state of intellectual perception is all that remains." This theory has, no doubt, been useful in calling attention to

² James's *Psychology*, Briefer Course, page 375.

one feature of the emotions that is often overlooked, namely, the reflex influence of bodily conditions; but it is quite another thing to say that these bodily conditions constitute the whole of the emotion. In the first place it is not clear why a cold, intellectual perception should produce the bodily changes to which James refers. It is much easier to suppose that the perception of approaching danger produces an excited state of mind and that this brings about the changed bodily conditions. These, no doubt, enter into the complex feeling as a whole, and make a part of the emotion, but not the whole of it, nor its essence. Attention needs but to be called to the fact that the same bodily symptoms may accompany very different emotions, and that the same emotion produces very different bodily conditions in different individuals. Tears may be tears of grief, tears of anger or tears of joy, and yet these emotions are wholly different. Again, there is such a thing as stony grief without any tears at all. It is only when the emotion finds an outlet in bodily conditions that its paroxysm passes and its force is spent. Take the well-known lines from Tennyson's "Princess":

"Home they brought her warrior dead,
She nor swooned, nor uttered cry,
All her maidens watching said,
She must weep or she will die."

In view of these facts, the best psychologists are not prepared to adopt the James-Lange theory.

Another striking feature of James's psychology is his treatment of the will. Evolutionary psychologists are disposed to adopt the theory of determinism. They say that although we think we are free in the act of willing, the whole process involves a foregone conclusion and the result follows from the nature and weight of the different motives, as does the resultant in physics, when a number of forces, acting in different directions are compounded. Huxley says that animals are only molecular machines, and man is only a higher animal; consequently it would seem absurd to say that there is any

room for real choice in the act of volition. In opposition to all this James takes strong ground in favor of free will. He admits that the solution of the problem cannot be reached from the standpoint of psychology; that you cannot lay your finger on the precise spot where freedom of volition lies; but he claims that by a concentration of attention upon this motive or that, the agent can make it stronger, as he chooses, and thus give it the victory. It is, however, especially on moral grounds, that he becomes the champion of free will. In his "Dilemma of Determinism" he says, "If a certain formula for expressing the nature of the world violates my moral demand I shall feel as free to throw it overboard, or at least to doubt it, as if it disappointed my demand for uniformity of sequence, for example; the one demand being, so far as I can see, quite as subjective and emotional as the other. The principle of causality, for example,—what is it but a postulate, an empty name covering simply a demand that the sequence of events shall some day manifest a deeper kind of belonging of one thing with another than the mere arbitrary juxtaposition which now phenomenally appears? It is as much an altar to an unknown god as the one that Saint Paul found at Athens. All our scientific and philosophic ideals are altars to unknown gods. Uniformity is as much so as free-will."³ "What does determinism profess? It professes that those parts of the universe already laid down absolutely appoint and decree what the other parts shall be. The future has no ambiguous possibilities hidden in its womb: the part we call the present is compatible with only one totality. Any other future complement than the one fixed from eternity is impossible. The whole is in each and every part, and welds it with the rest into an absolute unity, an iron block, in which there can be no equivocation or shadow of turning.

'With earth's first clay they did the last man knead,
And there of the last harvest sowed the seed,
And the first morning of creation wrote
What the last dawn of reckoning shall read.'

³ James's *Will to Believe*, page 147.

"Indeterminism, on the contrary, says that the parts have a certain amount of loose play on one another, so that the laying down of one of them does not necessarily determine what the others shall be. It admits that possibilities may be in excess of actualities, and that things not yet revealed to our knowledge may really in themselves be ambiguous. Of two alternative futures which we conceive, both may now be really possible; and the one become impossible only at the very moment when the other excludes it by becoming real itself. Indeterminism thus denies the world to be one unbending unit of fact. It says there is a certain ultimate pluralism in it; and, so saying, it corroborates our ordinary unsophisticated view of things. To that view, actualities seem to float in a wider sea of possibilities from out of which they are chosen; and, somewhere, indeterminism says, such possibilities exist, and form a part of truth."⁴

Such a view of the world, he admits, may, in a certain way seem irrational but every alternative to it is irrational in a deeper way. "The indeterminism with its maggots, if you please to speak so about it, offends only the native absolutism of my intellect, an absolutism which, after all, perhaps deserves to be snubbed and kept in check. But the determinism, with its necessary carrion, to continue the figure of speech, and with no possible maggots to eat the latter up, violates my sense of morality through and through."⁵ And this view, he thinks, is not inconsistent with the notion of a Providence governing the world, provided you do not restrict that Providence to formulating nothing but fatal decrees. If you allow Providence to provide possibilities as well as actualities to the universe, and to carry on His own thinking in those two categories just as we do ours, chances may be there uncontrolled even by Him, and the course of the universe be really ambiguous, and yet the end of all things may be just what He intended it to be from all eternity.

⁴ James's *Will to Believe*, page 150.

⁵ *Ibid.*, page 177.

The phenomenon of so-called double personality has recently attracted a great deal of attention and different theories have been advanced in explanation of the curious facts which come under this head. These facts take a very wide range, beginning with comparatively simple experiences in our daily life, of changed moods, of utter forgetfulness of whole series of facts, of new attitudes toward men and things which come and go without our being able to account for them. Then we have states supervening in cases of hysteria, and mental affections where the change is much more far reaching and complete; and finally we have instances like that portrayed by Mr. Stevenson in his "Doctor Jekyll and Mr. Hyde," where the whole personality changes, and the individual seems to live in two forms of consciousness, almost, or entirely independent of each other. As an illustration we may take the case of Mr. Ansel Bourne, a carpenter of Greene, Rhode Island, who was converted from atheism to Christianity in his thirtieth year, and then became an itinerant preacher. In January, 1887, he took \$550 from a bank in Providence, with which to pay for a certain lot of land in Greene, and got into a Pawtucket horse car. That was the last heard of him for two months. A few weeks later a stranger, calling himself A. J. Browne, came to Norristown, Penna., rented a small shop, stocked it with stationery, confectionery and fruit, and carried on his business in a quiet way, without seeming to any one unnatural or eccentric. On the morning of March 14, he woke up, said his name was Ansel Bourne, he was entirely ignorant of Norristown, knew nothing of shop keeping, and the last thing he remembered was drawing the money from the bank in Providence. His physician thought he was insane, but telegraphing to Providence, he found that he spoke the truth, and his nephew, Mr. Andrew Harris, came and took him home. Several weeks, between the time of his disappearance in Rhode Island and his appearance in Pennsylvania, remained unaccounted for, until it occurred to Professor James that by hypnotizing him it might be possible to clear up the mystery.

Mr. Bourne readily passed into the hypnotic state and thus became again Mr. Browne. He had heard of Ansel Bourne but did not know that he had ever met him. When confronted by Mrs. Bourne he said he had never seen her before, but he gave a minute account of his journeys during the last fortnight, and all the details of the Norristown episode.

Cases of this kind Professor James calls split personalities, and he accounts for them by assuming that our ordinary states of consciousness depend upon the coöperation of a large number of brain centers. When these fail to work in one connection, or are thrown out of gear, as he calls it, new combinations are formed, and an entirely different state of consciousness of disposition, and of personal identity results. Going hand in hand with this are other cases,⁶ where an individual, in his ordinary waking consciousness, will carry on a conversation or one train of thought, and at the same time will write automatically and unconsciously something entirely different, as if the hand were controlled by a different person. From this there is but a step to mediumship, and the whole field of psychical phenomena which lies beyond our normal experience and which led to the field of inquiry undertaken especially by the Society for Psychical Research in which Professor James was very deeply interested.

As a philosopher, Professor James is fully identified with what is usually called pragmatism. He is perhaps one of its first exponents, certainly one of its most prominent ones; although he has too clear a head to accept the extreme views of some of the writers who belong to the pragmatic school. The term "Pragmatism" and the specific doctrine for which it stands is the outgrowth of an article published by Mr. C. S. Peirce in the *Popular Science Monthly*, 1878. The article was called "How to Make our Ideas Clear," and in it Mr. Peirce laid down the thesis that the whole meaning of any subject consists in the habit or reaction which it establishes or in-

⁶ Case of Mr. Sidney Dean, of Warren, R. I. James's *Psych.*, Vol. I, p. 394.

duces, directly or indirectly, in us. "Consider what effects, which might conceivably have practical bearings, we conceive the object of our conception to have, then our conception of these effects is the whole of our conception of the object." The word practical is here used in its strict sense as referring to action, from the Greek word *pragma*, and in this way the name pragmatism came to designate the system of thought adopted by the new school of writers. The literature of pragmatism is very large, and there is a good deal of divergence, both of expression and thought, in the pragmatist camp. To understand more fully what the doctrine implies we may look at it from three different points of view, namely, that of psychology, that of logic, and that of metaphysics. In the first sense, Mr. Schiller defines it as the thorough recognition that the purposive character of mental life generally must influence and pervade also our most remote cognitive activities. There is no exception to be taken to the doctrine in this sense, and, in fact, it has served useful purposes in the philosophical discussions of the day. From the logical point of view pragmatism teaches that the conception or use, value or consequences of a reality forms part of the conception of it; or, that the conception of a reality consists solely in the conception of its use or value. The first of these alternatives is readily granted. It is the second especially against which the opposition to pragmatism is directed. It is claimed that the conception of an object, situation, or truth, as it includes awareness of its practical consequences, is more than a conception of its future, its results, or its use. Metaphysical pragmatism is the doctrine that reality is to be defined in the terms of progressively unfolding experience, and that there is, therefore, no absolute or complete reality. This form of pragmatism necessarily involves Pluralism, and it is usually expressed in the form of what is called Humanism. It means that there is no absolute being or absolute truth not relative to human faculties and human needs, that whatever we may know of reality in any form, can be known only so far as the reality enters into hu-

man experience, and forms a part of the processes of human life.

The two outstanding features of pragmatism are then first, a method of philosophizing, and secondly, a conception of truth, both of which are claimed to be new and of prime importance. It has already been said that James, as one of the leading exponents of pragmatism, is a thoroughgoing realist, or, as he himself says, a "radical empirist." He has room in his philosophy, of course, for the ideal, and he is sometimes classified as a "personal idealist," but all knowledge, he insists, begins in the perceptual order and the highest flights which it can attain must come back to the perceptual order, that is, they must find their validity or their verification in the perceptual order. "Grant an idea or a belief to be true. What concrete difference will its being true make in any one's actual life? What experiences may be different from those which would obtain if the belief were false? What, in short, is the truth's cash value in experiential terms?"⁷ The answer comes immediately: *True ideas are those which we can assimilate, validate, corroborate, and verify; false ideas are those we can not.* The truth of an idea is not a stagnant property inherent in it. Truth happens to an idea; it becomes true, is made true by events. Its validity is, in fact, an event, a process, the process, namely, of its verifying itself—its verification. Its validity is the process of its validation. Truth, therefore, is, in a sense, made by the mind, or it grows in the process of human experience, and, strictly speaking, there are for man no transcendent truths, no *a priori* ideas. All such come from perceptual experience and must be verifiable in that order. "For rationalistic writers, conceptual knowledge was not only the more noble knowledge, but it originated independently of all perceptual particulars. Such concepts as God, perfection, eternity, infinity, mutability, identity, absolute beauty, truth, justice, necessity, freedom, duty, worth, etc., and the part they play in our mind are, it was supposed,

⁷ *What is Truth?* Pref., p. v.

impossible to explain as results of practical experience. The empiricist's view, and probably the true view, is that they do result from practical experience."⁸ "If the aim of philosophy were the taking full possession of all reality by the mind, then nothing short of the whole of immediate perceptual experience could be the subject matter of philosophy. For only in such experiences is reality intimately and concretely found. But the philosopher, although he is unable as a finite being, to compass more than a few passing moments of such experience, is yet able to extend his knowledge beyond such moments by the ideal symbol of the other moments. He thus commands vicariously, innumerable percepts that are out of range but the concepts by which he does this, by thin extracts from perception are always insufficient representatives thereof; and although they yield wider information, must never be treated after the rationalistic fashion, as if they gave a deeper quality of truth. The deeper features of reality are found only in perceptual experience."⁹ The working of the mind, therefore, in the acquisition of knowledge, leads us, step by step, through the realm of actual experience, so that we learn to connect one thing with another, and determine the place and relation of each in the whole complex. In other words, we gain truth *non per saltum, sed ambulando*. It will be seen thus that intuition and *a priori* ideas are ruled out altogether, or, at all events, given a subordinate place as leading only to hypotheses, which are to be subsequently verified before they become true.

The definition of truth, that it is the agreement of our ideas with reality, Professor James says is accepted by both intellectualists and pragmatists. But the two schools differ widely as to their interpretation of the terms *agreement* and *reality*, and of the sphere and scope, therefore, which are to be assigned to the conception *truth*. The pragmatist says a conception or idea agrees with reality if it has practical conse-

⁸ *Some Problems of Philosophy*, page 55.

⁹ *Ibid.*, page 96.

quences which will work, if it leads to, or results in a future state that falls in with the details of our knowledge and experiences in other respects, and thus gives satisfaction to the mind. Given two ideas or concepts, however differently they may be worded, if they have the same consequences, if they produce the same results, they must be, in essence, the same; and given two concepts, which seem to be alternatives, if they have no possible future bearing on human experience, they do not lie within the realm of truth, they have no meaning, and they cannot be said to be either true or false. To these statements the critics of pragmatism, among the keenest of whom is Professor James B. Pratt, assistant professor of philosophy in Williams College, take exception. They assert that, in the first place, the reality to which our ideas correspond may lie beyond the realm of human experience. In the second place the true relation may exist where there are no possible future consequences to be expected. It may be added that ideas sometimes do work when in fact they are not true. Take for example the theory of Epicycles used in the Ptolemaic astronomy to account for the apparent retrograde motion of the superior planets, Mars, Jupiter and Saturn. We know that this apparent motion is due to the motion of the earth in opposite directions, in different parts of its orbit. But the other theory brought satisfactory results to the ancient astronomers, although no one would pretend to say that it was true. Professor Pratt says that an idea is true if it agrees with the reality for which it stands, if it is *as* the reality. Now the truth, he says, lies not in its verification or its consequences, but in the *as*-ness; it is true before it is demonstrated, and its truth includes more than its consequences, although, of course, the consequences are a part of it.

Of this philosophy, Professor James, is, as we have said, one of the leading exponents. Indeed, the spirit of pragmatism is manifest in all the spheres of his manifold activities. His philosophy proper, however, is more fully expressed in the two volumes of essays called *A Pluralistic Universe*, and the

Will to Believe. The viewpoint is expressed in the former, the practical bearing of it in the latter. It cannot be said that his philosophy is a system of thought, for he was not systematic. He is, however, a keen critic of other systems, and especially of monistic Hegelianism, and room is afforded in this way for the promulgation of his own view at different points in the discussion. His first objection lies against absolutism and determinism, which, according to his view, involves a fixed system of things from beginning to end, in which there is no shadow of variableness or turning; and he speaks with a great deal of contempt of what he calls a "block-universe," one which is ready made, or follows of necessity step by step in the process of its unfolding. His universe is one in the making, and it involves the working of many forces or agents, among which are you and I; no logical absolute, nor even an omnipotent God has determined beforehand what it shall be in its totality, or in all its details. "The difference between monism and pluralism is perhaps the most pregnant of all the differences in philosophy. *Prima facie*, the world is a pluralism; as we find it, its unity seems to be that of any collection; and our higher thinking consists chiefly of an effort to redeem it from that first crude form. Postulating more unity than the first experiences yield, we also discover more. But the absolute unity, in spite of brilliant dashes in its direction, still remains undiscovered, still remains a *Grenzbegriff*. 'Ever not quite' must be the rationalistic philosopher's last confession concerning it. After all that reason can do has been done, there still remains the opacity of the finite facts as merely given, with most of their peculiarities mutually unmediated and unexplained. To the very last, there are the various 'points of view' which the philosopher must distinguish in discussing the world; and what is inwardly clear from one point remains a bare externality and datum to the other. The negative, the alogical, is never wholly banished. Something—'call it fate, chance, freedom, spontaneity, the devil, what you will'—is still wrong and other and outside and uninclosed,

from your point of view, even though you be the greatest of philosophers. Something is always mere fact and givenness; and there may be in the whole universe no one point of view extant from which this would not be found to be the case. 'Reason' as a gifted writer says, 'is but one item in the mystery; and behind the proudest consciousness that ever reigned, reason and wonder blushed face to face. The inevitable stales, while doubt and hope are sisters. Not unfortunately the universe is wild—game flavored as a hawk's wing. Nature is miracle all; the same returns not save to bring the different. The slow round of the engraver's lathe gains but the breadth of a hair, but the difference is distributed back over the whole curve, never an instant true—ever not quite.'"¹⁰ Two consequences follow: first, this view necessarily involves human responsibility for the world that is to be; secondly, if things are not fixed, and reason at any point is unable to fathom the condition of things, "the will to believe," in order to accept, is necessary when options are forced upon us, as in the nature of the case, the problems of life will force them.

James has been charged with teaching that will has the power of making belief, and that you may believe what you please if you choose to do so. This is, of course, a misrepresentation. He does not teach any such nonsense, and has quite as much regard for reason and logic as any other philosopher. The point of his contention, however, is this: cases will continually arise when a real option is before the mind. He means by that that the issue for the person who has to choose is alive and not dead; secondly, that the option is forced or unavoidable; and thirdly that it is momentous. These three elements make what he calls a genuine option. Now, in such a case he contends that it is the part of wisdom to take counsel of our hopes rather than of our fears, that is to say, choose the alternative which promises a substantial good rather than the other one, for fear of making a mistake. In line with Mr. Balfour's reasoning in "Foundations of Belief," he says that

¹⁰ *Will to Believe*, Preface, p. 8.

although we think we are guided by reason in our professions of scientific or political or religious belief, we receive them largely on authority. We accept them as true and we act as if they were true without stopping to investigate each question for ourselves, or to verify the conclusions which we accept. In some of his Harvard lectures he speaks of what he calls the faith-ladder, which, he holds, presents a process which is not only justifiable but in many instances the only one to be pursued. "A conception of the world arises in us somehow, no matter how. Is it true or not you ask? It *might* be true somewhere you say, for it is not self-contradictory. It *may* be true, you continue, even here and now; it is *fit* to be true; it *would be well if it were true*; it *ought* to be true, you presently feel. It *must* be true, something persuasive in you whispers next; and then—as a final result—it shall *be held for true*, you decide; it shall be as if true for you. And your acting thus may in certain special cases be a means of making it securely true in the end."¹¹ This principle he applies, not only to a view of the world, or to the problems of our daily life, but also to matters of religion. The claims of religion especially are forced upon us from so many sides that we are obliged to recognize the force of the claim. True, on the other hand, there is no positive demonstration which is all-convincing, and therefore it is possible that the claims are not valid. Here there is a genuine option. I must here choose to recognize the claims of religion and act accordingly, or refuse to recognize them, which also is choice. It is much better and safer, therefore, to will to accept these claims and act accordingly, for to refuse, if they should be true, means total loss; and accepting them and acting upon them in the end may make them true, or verify them. The power itself ascribed to the will to believe is potent, and it rests upon a clearer authority than that of James: "If any man willeth to do his will, he shall know of the teaching, whether it be of God, or whether I speak for myself" (John, 7:17).

¹¹ *A Pluralistic Universe*, pp. 328-9.

James's attitude toward religion is more fully expressed in his *Varieties of Religious Experience*, a work which is of very great importance from different points of view. It shows his keen insight into the workings of the human mind and the candid spirit with which he meets all the aspects of human experience, so as to do them full justice. He divides men into two classes; the once born and the twice born. He means by the former the men of sunny disposition and even temper, who feel satisfied with themselves, have noble aspirations, and work toward the realization of their ideal without any great conflict or disturbance of mind. The others are those who find themselves beset by sin and temptation, and who have to struggle out of the prison house into the freedom which comes, as it were, by a new birth. He lays much stress on the Mystics' claim of true communion and fellowship with God, and makes account of all the various forms of religious phenomena with which history makes us familiar. He finds, in the first place, that man is "incurably religious," that is to say, the religious consciousness, the sense of a higher power, the feeling of something beyond to which we all owe allegiance, is innate and universal, at least so much so as to justify the term. In the second place he finds that the mystic frame of mind, as it prevails among men of all creeds, and in all ages, makes claims so definite and strong of an immediate experience of a Divine Being, that you must necessarily give them weight. And in the third place he feels convinced that the changes which he has seen in men's lives, the effects produced through religious influences are so real that they constitute a strong argument in favor of a reality back of these forms of belief and practice.

It will be seen thus that James's thinking leads to a positive evaluation of religion from the standpoint of human experience; and much account has been made of this fact. It must be admitted, however, that no matter how valuable or important these facts may be from the one side, they are painfully lacking on the other. It is the same "ever not quite," which

we have met before. Religion is not merely human, and it cannot be understood as a merely human phenomenon. It implies and recognizes the incoming of the Divine; a something not wrought by man, but wrought in man by a Higher Power, so as to satisfy the demands of faith, and afford full satisfaction to the restless longings of the soul. The lack of this is the painful void that is found in the religious literature of the day, which looks upon religion as a purely human development like art or morality. James himself is a pathetic example of what we mean. He fails to take his own medicine and therefore finds his longings unsatisfied. To show the personal side of his religion I will give an extract from a letter written to Prof. James H. Leuba, quoted by Professor Pratt in the *Hibbert Journal* for August, 1911. "If mystical states, with all their differences have a common nucleus, then this nucleus should be reckoned a coördinate factor with reason in the building up of religious belief. The intellect is interpretative and critical of its own interpretation; but there must have been a thesis to interpret, and that thesis seems to me to be the non-rational sense of a "higher" power. Religious men largely agree that this sense has been that of their "best" moments, best not only in passing but when looked back upon. The notion of it has leaked into mankind from their authority, the rest of us being imitative, just as we are of scientific men's opinions. Now may not this mystical testimony that there is a God be true, even though the precise determinations, being so "largely suggestive" contributions of our rational factor, should widely differ? It seems to me that to throw out the whole mystical life from a hearing, because of the facility with which it combines with discrepant interpretation, would be like throwing out the senses for a similar reason, from recognition as a factor of our "rational" knowledge. Is there diabolic mysticism? Even so there is toothache, nausea, vertigo, "nervousness." It is evident that our data are complex, however we confine them, and that *sifting* is necessary, be the mystical door left open or kept closed. The truth is what

will survive the sifting, sifting, by successive generations and "on the whole."

"I find it preposterous to suppose that if there be a feeling of unseen reality shared by large numbers of best men in their best moments, responded to by other men in their 'deep' moments, good to live by, strength giving, I find it preposterous, I say, to suppose that the goodness of that feeling for living purposes should be held to carry no objective significance, and especially preposterous if it combines harmoniously with our otherwise grounded philosophy of objective truth.

"My personal position is simple. I have no living sense of commerce with God. I envy those who have, for I know that the addition of such a sense would help me greatly. The Divine, for my active life, is limited to impersonal and abstract concepts which, as ideals, interest and determine me, but do so but faintly in comparison with what a feeling of God might effect if I had one. This, to be sure, is largely a matter of intensity, but a shade of intensity may make one's whole center of moral energy shift.

"Now, although I am so devoid of *Gottesbewusstsein* in the director and stronger sense, yet there is something in me which makes response when I hear utterances from that quarter made by others. I recognize the deeper voice. Something tells me 'Thither lies truth.' And I am sure it is not old theistic prejudices of infancy. Those in my case were Christian, but I have grown so out of Christianity that entanglement therewith on the part of a mystical utterance has to be abstracted from and overcome before I can listen. Call this, if you like, my mystical germ. It is a very common germ. It creates the rank and file of believers. As it withstands in my case, so it will withstand in most cases, all purely atheistic criticism; but interpretative criticism (not of the mere 'hysteric' and 'nerves' order) it can energetically combine with."

The subject of religion considered in this way from two points of view leads to another field of inquiry with which Professor James's name has been permanently identified. It

tells, on the one hand, the forms of human experience that take cognizance of a transcending something which we cannot apprehend through the senses and the operations of reason as such. In addition to this it involves the question of immortality, or the reality of spirit existence after death. We have already seen that in psychology Professor James avoids the use of the word soul or spirit to indicate the nature of mind. We have also seen that in the study of abnormal forms of personality he raises the question as to the extent to which the various phenomena of telepathy, clairvoyance and mediumship can be accounted for without resorting to the theory of spiritual influences operating upon the human personality, in what we call abnormal states. Orthodox science has been in the habit hitherto, either of offering a purely materialistic explanation, or of setting aside the whole series of phenomena as forms of hallucination and superstitious beliefs. Professor James was actively connected with the Society for Psychical Research, a society not composed of spiritualists who cherish a certain cult, and engage in certain practices with full belief that they are face to face with influences from the spirit world; but rather of hard-headed, or as James would say, tough-minded students of science who undertake to investigate all these abnormal phenomena by scientific methods, and in the interest of scientific knowledge. Professor James thinks that the researches of this Society have shown the necessity which is upon orthodox science to make earnest with these problems, and that it has won for them a place in the field of legitimate inquiry. He assumes, as a working hypothesis, the theory proposed by F. W. H. Myers of a superliminal consciousness, extending beyond the realm of our ordinary normal consciousness, and he thinks that the Society, in its inquiries and proceedings, has demonstrated the fact that there are conditions and influences apparent which cannot be explained on the ground of any known powers possessed by the ordinary or normal mind. The theory assumes that our ordinary consciousness is like the solar spectrum, which, as we know, is

extended by lower rays beyond the red and higher rays beyond the violet. Ordinary consciousness corresponds to the colored part of the spectrum. At the lower end we have subnormal conditions, the physiological extension in the form of mind-cure, stigmatization, of ecstasies, etc., and at the upper end we have the hypernormal cognitions of the medium trance. Now, although he thinks this theory is far from being established, he claims that it is the first attempt to bring all these various phenomena from hallucination on up to mediumship together, as connected parts of one whole subject. Undoubtedly the investigations of the Society have brought to light an immense amount of either superstition or downright fraud; but he claims that that is not a sufficient reason for relegating all these phenomena to the same category. He says that if you are to prove that not all crows are black, it is not necessary to prove that all crows are white; you prove your proposition if you show one white crow. Now he says Mrs. Piper is his white crow, a trance medium whom he has personally investigated for a number of years, under conditions which make fraud utterly impossible, and with results which can in no way be referred to her own powers, or the activity of her normal mind. What they are and where they come from has not been scientifically demonstrated. Many of them may be accounted for on the principle of telepathy, but there is a residuum of phenomena and results of which the influence of discarnate spirits seems to be as yet the only solution. If this solution is granted it will afford an explanation of mystical religious experiences brought about in this realm of supra-normal consciousness, and demonstrate the existence of the soul or spirit after death.

As we have said, the Society contains members who are eminent in various departments of science and whilst some of them, Mr. Podmore for instance, are still skeptical, many more, among whom are Oliver Lodge, Mr. Balfour, Professor Crooks, and we may say Professor James, are convinced of the reality of the phenomena, and have no explanation other than that which has been suggested. On the other hand there are those

like Sir Oliver Lodge who claim that they have had absolutely convincing evidence of messages which could have come only from men who have passed through the gateway of death into the Great Beyond. Professor James was very much interested in questions of this kind, and it is well known that before his death he promised a number of his friends that if it were possible, he would, after his departure return to them and give them evidence of his continued existence. The question may fairly be asked, Has he fulfilled this promise? It is well known that there has appeared in the newspapers of the day within the last few months an article purporting to come from members of the American Institute for Scientific Research; this article claims that at least on six different occasions, from the evening of October 22, 1910, to March, 1911, Professor James, through a medium, has communicated with members of the Society and that he has thus fulfilled his promise. One statement is to the effect that within forty-eight hours of his death he sent a message to one of the members through a medium before the medium had heard of his decease. This is important if true; but it does not necessarily prove a communication from the spirit world. It might have been a case of telepathy. It must be said that the communications reported to have been received are of such a nature and there is such an absolute want of identification, or proof of personal identity, that a tough-minded thinker may have serious doubts as to their genuineness. This does not mean that the persons concerned are consciously practicing fraud, but simply that they may be taking the workings of the medium's own subliminal consciousness for communications from Professor James. There is the usual statement of the very great difficulties which the spirit experiences in communicating with the circle of friends. The expression of the hope that by and by he will learn to do it better; that in the sphere of his present existence the tendency is so strong to soar to higher realms of thought and activity, and to get away from contact with the life of this world, that it requires a great deal of effort to resist

the impulse. There is a reiteration again and again of desire to offer proof of personal identity, but not a scintilla is forthcoming, and in connection with all this we have some performances which are exceedingly trivial, and to an outsider, seem to be foolish; for instance, Professor James, speaking through the medium, greets his friends in the circle, and he is introduced to a number of others whom he does not know, and he shakes hands with them by proxy, and says he is glad to meet them. To any one who knew Professor James, and the seriousness with which he treated questions of this kind, the whole appearance of things is very far from reassuring. It is said, however, that the Society has received some more significant communications and some which possess positive evidential value. These have not yet been published. If there are such, they will no doubt appear in the proceedings of the Society for Psychical Research. Meanwhile we are fully justified in the opinion that the publication of such trivialities prejudices the whole case.

After this cursory survey of a very wide field, what shall we say of William James? First of all, I think, we shall find, as we said at the beginning, that his robust, vigorous thinking, his restless activity, his love for the concrete and practical, his insistent demand that the truth of all ideas shall be tested by their empirical consequences, are in line with and representative of our American life and spirit, the keynote of which seems to be found in the gospel of "efficiency." But, in the second place, it would be a great mistake to suppose then when he speaks of the "cash value" of ideas, and lays stress upon their "consequences," he means to emphasize the importance of pecuniary success and worldly prosperity. He represents, rather, the better spirit of our striving, the realization of high ideals; and he enforces with all the power at his command the claims of duty and the responsibility which is upon us to make the world better and happier by cherishing the things that are true, and honorable, and just, and pure and lovely, and of good report. And, although for him the ideals of life

are not given us in their totality and have to be made and striven for, he brings us face to face with unseen realities and justifies the hope expressed by Tennyson:

“Yet I doubt not through the ages one increasing purpose runs,
And the thoughts of men are widened with the process of the suns.

Not in vain the distance beacons. Forward, forward let us range;
Let the great world spin forever down the ringing grooves of change.

LANCASTER, PA.

II.

THE MARKS OF THE PROPHET.¹

FLOYD W. TOMKINS.

"As He spake by the mouth of His holy prophets, which have been since the world began."—St. Luke 1: 70.

This magnificent and inspired declaration of the Jewish priest Zacharias, uttered at the feast of the circumcision of his son John, gives, as it were, a bird's-eye view over the whole world's history and asserts a truth of the first importance. Since God made the world He has always had witnesses, messengers, preachers amongst men. Never since the Almighty gave shape to His divine love in the creation of matter and of man has He separated Himself from His creation. Even amongst heathen nations, as St. Paul declared at Lystra, "He left not Himself without witness, in that He did good, and gave rain from heaven and fruitful seasons, filling men's hearts with food and gladness." And somewhere on the earth there were as well personal witnesses always, connecting links, as it were, between the Creator and the created. Modern science has never succeeded in overthrowing this great fact, though some scientists have ignored it. The noblest and wisest have acknowledged it and echoed St. Paul's words: "The invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead." Prophets, then, are men of no mean order, for they have a succession not merely

¹ The Annual Sermon delivered May 8, 1912, by the Reverend Floyd W. Tomkins, D.D., LL.D., of the Church of the Holy Trinity, Philadelphia, Pa., before the graduating class of the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in the United States, at Lancaster, Pa.

apostolic but age-long. And they who cry for a *new* revelation are at fault in that they fail to hear the message which has been coming from God, and has never been silenced, since Jehovah declared concerning His work, "it is very good." If it had been left for man to work his way upward to a knowledge of God—if there had never been any prophecy, or if it were a comparatively modern thing—then might the way have been hard indeed, and unbelief rested at least upon a basis of interrogation. "Oh that I knew where I might find Him" would be the unsatisfied cry of the exiled child of an unknown father, and there could be but the "ineradicable hope" to lure men on to an ever-evading destiny. But there can be no banishing of the supernatural from the natural, no separation of man from God, no questioning of origin or end when we consider the "goodly fellowship of the prophets." And herein lies the power of our present work. It is no new thing which we inaugurate here to-day, my brethren, when we send a fresh company out to prophesy. Our action is not a mere part of modern religious economy any more than these, our brothers, are merely a modern body of witnesses to give testimony concerning a modern faith. Away down through the ages has come this clear line of men, and in their joined hands a connection is evidenced, a connection between heaven and earth, between God and His children. What an inspiring truth! We are no apologists here for a new system or a new religion. We have our credentials in ranks unbroken through all the world's history. We are prophets, and our ancestry is exact and reliable, as old as the world itself.

More forcible still does this truth become when we read again the words of Zacharias: "*As He spake* by the mouth of His holy prophets." God has established this human agency as a means through which He speaks to His people. The voice of the prophet is the voice of God. It matters little that God through the centuries has used varied methods of inspiration. Whether, as in the early days, He spoke face to face and then bade the prophet go and declare the message, or whether, as in

these later days, the man with humbled heart kneels in his study and listens for the word the Lord would have him speak; the unbroken testimony is that the man is not a preacher of his own ideas nor a minister serving after his own fashion. God speaks by his mouth. The truth he declares is God's truth. Hence the tremendous power of the prophets in all ages with the people. The hungry souls of men have cried "what hath the Lord spoken," and the truly inspired preacher has answered, with a full confidence in his message: "thus saith the Lord." There is something overwhelming in this great truth when once we freely grasp it. No matter for the false prophets just now, nor for the periods when they seemed to be few who carried the testimony of the Lord. No matter for the barren ages when the general communication between God and man seemed to have been cut off and men wandered after their own fashion in the blind satisfaction of their own will. There was no break in the prophetic office, though these sad periods demand a search for the message and the messenger. So we can disregard in our view these seemingly silent times, while we seize the superb fact that God has *never* left Himself without witness since the world began. Nor need we just now stop to consider the confusion of voices when here and there men's minds were perplexed and their faith weakened by a babel of sounds through which only a few could detect the "still small voice" quietly speaking its eternal message of love and warning and interest. The point I would have you recognize is that this great current of divine guidance and instruction has always gone on and is still going on. As one who knows music can trace the theme in some wonderful symphony even when it seems swallowed up in the excess of rioting notes or when it seems to be slipping away in some thin and hesitating chords of modulation, so the believer can hear this one tone of prophecy sounding through all the years, an unceasing testimony that God is not far away and that His truth endureth from generation to generation. Oh, the blessed inspiration of it all! Well did Browning make old Abt Vogler sing in superb faith:

"Therefore to whom turn I but to Thee, the ineffable Name?
Builder and maker, Thou, of houses not made with hands.
What, have fear of change from Thee Who art ever the same?
Doubt that Thy power can fill the heart that Thy power expands?
There shall never be one lost good! What was, shall live as before;
The evil is null, is naught, is silence implying sound;
What was good shall *be* good, with, for evil, so much good more;
On the earth the broken arcs; in the heaven a perfect round.

All we have willed or hoped or dreamed of good shall exist;
Not its semblance, but itself; no beauty, nor good, nor power
Whose voice has gone forth, but each survives for the melodist
When eternity affirms the conception of an hour.
The high that proved too high, the heroic for earth too hard,
The passion that left the ground to lose itself in the sky,
Are music sent up to God by the lover and the bard;
Enough that He heard it once; we shall hear it by and by.

And what is our failure here but a triumph's evidence
For the fulness of the days? Have we withered or agonized?
Why else was the pause prolonged but that singing might issue thence?
Why rushed the discords in, but that harmony should be prized?
Sorrow is hard to bear, and doubt is slow to clear;
Each sufferer says his say, his scheme of the weal and woe:
But God has a few of us whom He whispers in the ear;
The rest may reason and welcome: 'tis we musicians know!"

Yes, 'tis we prophets who *know*! Our message is spoken by the same God Who through all time has revealed Himself to men. Enfired by Him Who spake as never man spake, with a message made more full and complete by the Christ of Calvary, the unbroken line moves on to bring back earth to its God, to bring back God to His earth, to lead men to redemption and peace, to speak the divine will that it may be done on earth as in Heaven.

I have taken the title "prophet" in its broadest sense. It covers alike preacher and comforter, the declarer of truth and the giver of gifts left for the church's consolation. Let us think now of some of the marked characteristics of this prophetic office and of the schools of the prophets. We will not go into any exact or historical criticism of the prophets of the Bible times and their teaching. Those who have not done so

may well turn to that great book of Dr. Samuel Lee on the *Nature, Progress and End of Prophecy*, one of those old books which have a perennial freshness and which in these days of somewhat erratic statement and thought, serve as good anchors. Simply and briefly we will indicate some of the great marks alike of the men and the means by which the men were fitted, in the hope that our hearts may be newly inspired and our zeal rekindled by the fire from Heaven which has never gone out on earth since first the divine hand touched it into glow.

I. Joy.

Nothing is more fascinating than a study of the lives and methods and emotions of the earliest prophets. Miriam the prophetess went before the triumphal company of the redeemed Israelites with music and dance, and echoed the prophetic hymn of Moses. Samuel gathered the young prophets in his school at Ramah, and with psaltery, harp, tabret, pipe and cymbals they gave utterance to their revelations. No wonder that when the youthful and, as yet, genuine Saul met the line of them descending from the leafy huts where they abode in Naioth, he was seized by the contagion of their happy inspiration, and danced and sang with them! Indeed we find in all the prophets of Israel that poetic spirit which led them to speak their messages in rhythm, and what is poetry but an expression of the heart's deepest emotions? So did the early disciples begin their journey from the Mount of the Ascension to Jerusalem—that first journey of their newly-found prophetic authority—with joy. And with however much of sadness or even sternness the preacher at times has felt bound to declare his message, it has ever been the rejection of his message rather than any over-exalting of his office that hid the joy. And why should there not have been happiness on the part of these men alike of the Old and New Testament? Had not God spoken to them? Were they not the men into whose ears God had “whispered” (for such is the force of the Hebrew in at least one place in the history of Samuel where “the Lord uncovered his ear,” *i. e.*, as

it were moved back the long hair and spoke in secret His word)? Had they not a close intimacy with Jehovah, even as the Apostles had a close intimacy with the Master, and later had breathed *into* them as well as upon them the power of the Holy Ghost? No uncertainty as to the genuineness of their truth or fear as to its power molested them. No self-consciousness or studied stiffness held them in thrall. Theirs was the delight of listening while the Lord spake and then of delivering the truth with all unction and enthusiasm. Theirs was the high glory of declaring a mediatorship between God and men, and no shadow of doubt concerning God or His final purpose and victory rested upon them.

May it not be that in our modern prophetic schools there is lacking something of this joy which now, as long ago, may well be born out of the consciousness of a high purpose and a strong inspiration? If theology is but one—albeit the highest—of the sciences; if it is to be studied regardless of a divine in-breathing of grace; if the intellectual and consequently human element is to have the place of honor and of authority, then indeed must the old prophetic habit of infatuation with the office and its work disappear. You cannot draw joy from books any more than you can draw tears from stones, unless the heart in those books and the heart that reads has heard and is ever hearing a divine voice of truth. But if—and is it a large “if”?—the Seminary of the twentieth century A. D. is like the prophetic school of the twelfth century B. C., at least in this, that men come together to rejoice in their common calling, to clear the ear for the hearing of God’s truth, and to fit the heart for an ever-increasing love and loyalty to Him Who waits to speak, as well as loyalty to the needs of those who outside the sacred precincts are waiting to hear the word spoken;—if the chief idea is the consecration of life and person so that the pure heart shall see God and the character bear witness—then why might not the metaphor of the old instruments with their joy and the old dancing and the old rhythmic singing yet stand? There is nothing herein to militate against the highest

and the deepest learning; God's need for minds to-day is as great as His need for hearts. But there is *much* which militates against a hard and soulless dogmatism and a heartless and needless vivisection of things made holy by Him Who gave them and by the lives they have sanctified; there is much which contends against a cold isolation from ecstasie devotion and human need.

Much more must this joy be the part of the modern prophet, whether he gather it from his school or not. If the heart of any man can be glad, surely the minister's heart may exceed in gladness. Think of his privilege—he is God's messenger! Think of his exaltation—the Almighty speaks to him! Think of his company—he is one of the goodly fellowship of the prophets! Think of his service—to tell men in their need that which God has told him! Weary? Shame on the heart or head which tires of the King's truth! Worn? Alas for the body which is not transfigured by the prophetic livery of the Eternal! Perplexed as to what he shall preach? Can he forget so soon the message of the Master?—And yet, there is not the joy in work to-day amongst the prophets for which we might look. Witness the reaction of Monday! Witness the complaining and the human jealousy. Witness the heavy step and the yet heavier heart. God forbid that I should make His ministry a thing of light and surface frivolity! There are tears for us to-day as for the great Jeremiah. Emotions are not all of one sort, and “the eyes that cannot weep are the saddest eyes of all”! But these sorrows are to be felt for the world's rejection of God, not for our own rejection by men. True agony indeed must the prophet have, but it is the agony of a desire which even consumes him. And back of all, beneath all, rests ever the promise as old as the office he holds—“Lo, I am with you.” I wonder that no man has written of the joy of the ministry. Those of us who knew him can easily imagine how Phillips Brooks could have made such a book leap from the very consecration of his nature. All his sermons are full of it. To read God's Word, to pray in the sanctuary,

to preach God's truth in all its infinite phases and phrases, to baptize into the Kingdom, to break the Bread of Life, to visit the sick, to comfort the bereaved and point them to the skies, to guide children, to serve the weak, to rebuke the erring, to stand up as a hero for righteousness, to urge reform in manners and morals, to inspire leadership,—and then to come to the quiet hour and in silence to kneel before the Throne of Him Who gave the commands we have tried to execute, full of a peaceful confidence, not in work well done, but in the mercy and love which can use frail man as an agency for salvation! Surely the Christ said not in vain: "Your joy no man taketh from you." Oh, may He make us true to this old lasting mark of His age-long prophets!

II. TRUST.

No pessimist can be a prophet. The converse also is exact if we add an adjective: no *true* prophet can be a pessimist. The tremendous faith of the Bible prophets is incomprehensible to one who knows not what the prophetic office means. Never did they seem to question God. "Thus saith the Lord" was to them an end of all questioning. How grandly Isaiah cried: "He wakeneth mine ear to hear as the learned"; and again: "The Lord God hath opened mine ear and I was not rebellious." Elijah never doubted God; his fear was for the people who would not hear. And if at times there was questioning it was rather as to what God willed than as to what He planned. There must have been somewhat of this confidence taught in their schools. Certainly the Master was constantly teaching it to His disciples. "Trust, fear not, believe, have faith"—these were His words repeated unceasingly in His blessed peripatetic school of divinity. Ought not our modern schools to have somewhat of the same character? Should there not be in them not merely an element of trust but a *current*, an *atmosphere*, of faith which should permeate and magnetize? Are our prophetic institutions what they ought to be if they lead to doubt and questioning and uncertainty rather than to

a mighty buttressing of faith? Of course, deeper study may often, by overturning early ignorance, cause a temporary floundering. Of this we need only say that when the heart is true and the consecration honest no harm can ever result. But I ask in all frankness whether there is not danger to-day, as, perhaps, in all our institutions of learning, so especially in our seminaries, of making the laboratory more important than the text-book, of establishing research work rather than imparting fixed and revealed truth, of trying to make theologians rather than ministers and preachers? There is a place for research work; there is a place for scholars and theologians; but it is the place of specializing; it is the place of discovery; it is the place of inquiry; and it is a place which has no limit simply because truth is infinite and in many of its phases we can only experiment. But what the prophets, as prophets, need is fact, the old fixed truth of the ages. What the world wants the prophet to do is to come with a clear knowledge and a definite message. She is willing enough that research and experiment should go on; she is ready to accept anything which research and experiment have surely established as fact; but she wants the simple, plain truth of God spoken by her preachers with no uncertain accent for her regular needs and her common life. And if the prophetic schools do not send her such—if the preachers do not come out of the seminary hot with the glorious message of God's love which is as real to them and as sure as the heart that beats within them, then something is at fault. With somewhat of diffidence in this presence, and yet with boldness, I express the fear that we are carrying on research work to excess in theology, both Biblical and dogmatic, and forcing it too much upon our students when not one in a hundred has any fitness or desire for it or any intention of continuing it, to the detriment of the great fundamentals of the prophetic office which it is preëminently the first duty of the prophet to proclaim. Brethren, religion must be adapted to the age, and it must be accurate in statement according to the best light attainable. But the preaching of the Gospel which

is to save men, the telling of the message which God gives, is the most important thing. Alas for us, if we dally so long in the fascinating fumes of the laboratory that we forget the hungry souls for whom God has a clear, strong word which He bids us speak!

Especially must the prophet himself have this supreme trust. He must speak the things he knows. He must be no doubter nor speak in any terms of interrogation. The old "categorical imperative" must lead him, that, like his Master, he may speak with authority. And his faith must be in the power of Him Whose message he brings. If he doubts the world's ultimate salvation, if he questions whether the world is growing better, if he thinks that perhaps the power has gone from the old gospel of salvation—then the hungry world will turn from him as from one who has no faith in the very faith he preaches. Back of all the many trials and faults of today in the Church of God, back of all the many explanations for this or that failure, lies, I believe, this lack of essential force, due to a lack of essential confidence in God and His truth. Oh, may the Christ of grace restore to us the trust of the mighty prophets of all the ages, that we may find *conviction* the power of our speech and *assurance* the impulse of our message! For the Spirit can give more power only to the man who believes in the power already given.

III. CLEARNESS OF VIEW.

No student of the prophets of the past can fail to see how their success was proportioned to their clearness of vision. Isaiah's vision of the Throne (Isa. VI; 1-8) was but an example of the positiveness of his sight and knowledge always. He knew the end from the beginning, not in detail but in fact. From God, for God, to God—that was the burden of his preaching. I believe the gift of foretelling the future, all through the Bible, is made vastly subordinate to the expression of clear views of love and service and duty in this present that good may come in the future. You remember how Tennyson sings of the poet:

"The poet in a golden clime was born,
 With golden stars above;
 Dower'd with the hate of hate, the scorn of scorn,
 The love of love.

He saw through life and death, through good and ill,
 He saw through his own soul,
 The marvel of the everlasting will,
 An open scroll,

Before him lay; with echoing feet he threaded
 The secretest walks of fame:
 The viewless arrows of his thoughts were headed
 And winged with flame."

Substitute "prophet" for "poet" and you have the truth of the clearness of vision of the preachers of old who moved and saved men because they themselves knew what life meant; while John Stuart Mill's cry: "What am I? Whence came I? Whither am I going?" becomes the creed of the blind unbeliever. And there must have been something in the prophetic schools of old which gave this distinctness of vision. What it was we can but dimly conjecture, but that it was there who can doubt, when he considers the Bible story and the men who came from the schools ready to prophesy?

In our day there is much of vagueness concerning even the origin and purpose of religion as well as its methods. "From God to man," some cry; "from man to God" cry others. Even the incarnation in its blessedness is twisted until it seems to mean "man was made God" rather than "God was made man." Hence the blundering and the consequent haziness of much modern prophecy. Dr. Patton never spoke more truly than when he said: "There are but two positions. We are at the point where the roads fork. It is not a question of more creed or less creed; it is not a question of revising this or revising that. Let us not be deceived by raising a false issue. The sharp antithesis is before us. Christianity is either a piece of information supernaturally given with respect to a way of salvation, or else it is simply a phase of a great cosmic

process, explicable in terms of a mere naturalistic evolution. That is your issue. If you take the latter view, then there is nothing supernatural—no virgin birth, no resurrection, no atonement, no sin, no hope for the future—nothing distinctly in your Christianity worth keeping. If you take the former view, then the evangelical Christianity of Jesus Christ and Him crucified stands in all its power, and we may say today with as much assurance as the Apostle said it: “I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God and the wisdom of God unto salvation.”

No uncertain plan, no uncertain way, no uncertain history can there be for him who to-day would be a true prophet through whose mouth God shall speak. There is no part of all our Seminary training more important than history, not of the church only but of the world, studied in the light of the guidance and revelation of God. Not so much what men have done or taught or believed or practiced as what God has done and taught and revealed through men and through human events and actions—that is history indeed. God is in the world through nature—yes; but God was once in the world *in person*, all time before His coming pointing with golden arrow-head forward and all time since pointing backward to Him.

Oh, the blessedness of such a clearness of vision as that! The prophet stands up with his message and the whole world, even as his own heart, lies open before him, and he tells the story that others may see the vision too! No limits in space or time; no limits in power or influence! The Alpha and Omega! “Jesus Christ, the same yesterday and today and forever”; “Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world”—on these he bases his message and preaches until men are caught up into the very life of God!

IV. PERSONAL CONSECRATION.

I must keep you a moment longer that I may just mention another characteristic of the prophets—namely, their personal consecration. Brethren, they were not their own, and they

knew it. Sometimes the knowledge led, as it leads still, to the giving up of all earthly possessions; it is a healthy figure. Sometimes it led to a loneliness, almost a grotesqueness of life and dress. But back of all was the fact: God had called them and given them a message, and cried, "go tell it to My people"—and after that nothing much mattered as regarded themselves in the possessions or glory of life. Christ was all to the Apostles; His glory was theirs. I believe the early prophetic schools of the Bible taught this consecration and made the prophets feel it almost as a test of their fitness. Therein, I believe, lies the chief work of our modern schools. To teach the exact rendering of the message, to guide in the manner of its deliverance, to make the message clear and strong in the minds and hearts of the messengers—all that is good and necessary; but to teach absolute and complete consecration that the ear may hear the whisper of the Infinite—that, *that* is the work which shall fit the prophets for their task! Hardness?—yes, and we want a bit of heroism. Denial?—it is the very essence of humility that the man preach not himself but God's message. A burial of personal qualities? Nay, but a consecration of them so that God can use them for His cause. And the man who really loves God and glories in the honor of delivering His message finds no weariness or over-severity in the calling. Into the task he casts all his powers; to it he gives all his time; it makes him like his crucified Master: with head near Heaven that he may hear the word spoken; with feet fixed on the solid faith which has stood as a rock of divine planting; and with his hands outstretched in pleading, in exhortation, in rebuke, in mercy, to a world longing for life yet ignorant how to live.

What a glorious work for man! What a holy line, this of the prophets through whose mouths God has ever spoken and is speaking still! What a precious task, this of the prophetic school, to prepare the youthful sons of the prophets for the fine fulfilment of their calling! God, oh our God, give us grace that in these latter days the line waver not nor weaken! Give us the spirit of the prophets of old to whom we lift our

eyes and know that they, ministering spirits, even now are ready to help us! As Matthew Arnold sang of his great human father and his co-workers, as he meditated in Rugby Chapel, so may we sing as we remember this goodly fellowship of the prophets and are sadly conscious of our own weakness:

“Then in such hour of need
Of your fainting, dispirited race,
Ye, like angels, appear,
Radiant with ardor divine,
Beacons of hope, ye appear!
Languor is not in your heart,
Weakness is not in your word,
Weariness not on your brow.
Ye alight in our van! at your voice,
Panic, despair flee away.
Ye move through the ranks, recall
The stragglers, refresh the outworn,
Praise, re-inspire the brave.
Order, courage, return;
Eyes rekindling and prayers,
Follow your steps as ye go.
Ye fill up gaps in our files,
Strengthen the wavering line,
Stablish, continue our march,
On to the bound of the waste,
On to the City of God.”

My brothers, you who are about to graduate, I congratulate you. I almost envy you the fresh joy of the service upon which you are about to enter. You are to join this long line of the prophets. You are to carry on the message which has been sounding all through the centuries. I bid you welcome to the ranks of the never-failing prophets. Rejoice in your high honor. Tell the story as men who know its meaning and its power and its glory. Hold fast to the old faith, for men are hungry for it, and it alone can help them to live and prepare them for heaven. Live near to Christ that from the closeness of your worship you may bring light to a dark world. Above all else, be true to your King in your own personal loyalty, and then your work will be well done and His blessing at last will be yours.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

III.

THE PLACE OF THE CHRISTIAN MINISTER IN ORGANIZED SOCIETY.

A. O. REITER.

A Robinson Crusoe, living alone on his wave-washed island, is his own prophet, priest, and king; even as he is his own doctor, tailor, shoemaker, housebuilder and cook. But the moment the man Friday appears there is a division of labor and of responsibility. Each renders some service to the other, and in return each receives some benefit from the labors of the other. Society begins to be organized, and labors to be divided wherever two or three live together. In the savage tribe, from the chief to the veriest drudge, each has duties, the performance of which entitles him to protection, a share in the tribal possessions, and the loyalty of all other members of the tribe. As civilization advances the organization of society becomes more complex; the arts, sciences, trades, and professions multiply in number, while the specific duties devolving upon any one individual decrease in inverse ratio. The division of labor leads to its subdivision, and in turn to specialization. Ours is an age of specialization—not an unmixed blessing by any means. But whether we wish it so or not, the man who would take and keep a place in organized society, must learn to do some one thing well, then do that one thing. The tremendous change that is taking place in the organization of the industrial world must be apparent to all. Within the memory of men now living, the shoemaker made shoes and sold them. To-day half a hundred pairs of hands contribute their several distinct activities to the making of a single shoe, before it reaches the salesman. The butcher once bought his own cattle, hogs and sheep, slaughtered them, cut the meat and sold it,

to-day there are men working in our great packing houses who from year's end to year's end do nothing but ply a small bell-shaped instrument for removing the few hairs left by the scraping machine from behind the dead hog's ears. This specialization in labor has resulted in great gain for the economic management of large industries, but it is to be feared with a corresponding decrease in the general efficiency of laborers. The savage indian who roamed our hills, armed with his bow and arrow, and dependent on his wits and skill to secure his daily food, had far more to challenge his mental activities and develop all his powers of manhood, than have many of these so-called skilled workmen in the huge mechanisms of modern industry. Using one set of muscles, doing the same thing over and over again ten thousand times in a day and every working day in the year, until the workman no longer needs to use his mind but can direct every motion by the reflexes that originate in the spinal cord is deadening to intelligence, to character and to personality alike. On the other hand this same division of labor has given to other men tremendously increased responsibility for the exercise of thinking power along certain specific lines. The training of the professional man, instead of the year or two spent in some doctor's or lawyer's office, or some pastor's study has become a long and intricate process. The world expects more, and has a right to expect more of the man trained for one specific duty, than it had a right to expect of the all around man of generations past.

Into this organism of human society the minister of the gospel must fit somewhere, unless he is to cease to be, and "the foolishness of preaching" is to be classed among the lost arts of the world. He must find his place. He must find the one thing needful in modern society that he is prepared and equipped to supply. He must render that one essential service, and leave to the rest of society all other duties. Then, and then only, has he a right to expect recognition, and the protection of social institutions.

But what is that one essential service? What are the minister's specific duties to society? What has society a right to ask of him? And what should be his own ideal of his own function and office? These are old questions. Some think they were answered, once for all, ages ago. But the fact that the mere asking of them in this twentieth century starts controversies everywhere, shows that the world yet awaits their true answer. They are questions vital to the church of to-day, for upon the correct or incorrect answer to them depends in large measure the whole future of Christianity.

If you should walk down street in any American city and ask every one of the first one hundred men you meet, Have you ever in your life received any valuable service from a Christian minister, service that only a minister of the gospel could render acceptably, and what was that service? Probably one or two would answer, "I have never received any such service and never expect to do so." For the purpose of this discussion that small minority may be neglected. Not to use a shorter and uglier word, they are mistaken. But if the remainder answer truly, a considerable number will say: "Yes, a minister of the gospel has held a funeral service at the grave of one or more of my loved ones, and I hope some minister will say a good word for me when the same necessity arises." Whether flattering to the minister or not, it is a fact that a large part of those who go to make up organized society to-day have no use for him and no desire for any service at his hands, except when there is a death in the family. The minister and the undertaker are put into the same class as necessary evils, except for this one important distinction—the undertaker must be paid.

Another relatively large contingent of our supposed one hundred would answer: "Yes, I belong to the church, I was baptized by a minister, confirmed by a minister, or as the case may be, converted under the preaching of a minister, I have received communion from a minister and when I was sick the minister visited me and prayed for me, I hope to die in the

church and receive Christian burial." But if the questions are pressed farther, you will find that many have fallen away from their first love, and only a comparatively few are regular attendants at the services of the church, and fewer still are taking any active part in the aggressive work of the Kingdom of God. Why? "Aye there's the rub." It is not only the hanger-on, whose tale of woe is legion, and whose conception of the church is simply that of a fire escape, who is dissatisfied with the existing order. It is not simply the man who looks upon the minister as a parasite on the body politic, that reminds us that the minister has not found his place in organized society. The earnest faithful Christian too is often loud in his complaint, that an effective service is not being rendered by the minister of to-day. Suppose we take the next thousand men we meet and ask them to tell us in what way the minister can so amend his ways, direct his activities, and utilize his time as to render to society his own peculiar and necessary service. It is right here that Bedlam breaks loose. Listen.

An exceedingly complex and intricate organism creates many different types of people with widely varying tastes and interests. The ministers of our churches are failing to reach and serve and help many people because they do not adapt their work to the needs of the people. On every hand there are distracting amusements more or less sinful. The minister should devise counter attractions in the church. He should provide picture shows, and a bowling alley. He should organize a base ball team, a cooking school, and a literary society. The great battle for a juster division of the world's wealth is on, and the minister has lost his opportunity to reach and hold the working man by failing to ally himself with the labor union, or give his unqualified approval to this or that scheme for political or economic revolution. The saloon is ruining us politically and individually, and many ministers are too cowardly to come out into the open to fight the saloon either in the courts or at the polls. The red light hells yawn for our boys and girls, and the minister

refuses to join in a crusade to abolish them. The Young Men's Christian Association, the Christian Endeavor Society, the Brotherhood of Andrew and Philip, the Laymen's Missionary Movement, the Men and Religion Forward Movement, the Boy Scout Movement, the King's Daughters, the Anti-Saloon League, the Front Line Movement in the Sunday School, the Organized Bible Class, and all the rest of that legion of societies, guilds, movements, and organizations that earnest Christian workers have invented to help the minister in his work do not receive the share of the minister's time and attention he ought to give them if he is to receive the best results from them. The best brains of the world are busy wrestling with the problems of science for human betterment and the relief of human suffering, but the minister, deaf to the call of the living world, continues to take texts from a discredited bible and to preach worn-out and unscientific dogmas. And, per contra, the good old gospel has been destroyed by higher criticism and the so-called scientific method. The minister of to-day fails to find and fill his place in organized society because he has departed from the doctrines and ideals of the past. The minister spends far too much time and effort in intellectual work, preparing literary essays for his pulpit, and far too little in the good old art and practice of pastoral visiting, is the complaint of one and the next man is equally sure that the same minister, spends far too much time gadding about among the people and too little on the preparation of his sermons.

In short the vast majority who either through indifference or zeal are willing to give to the Christian minister a place in society, are entirely willing that the minister should serve them, provided that service take not the form his own conscience dictates, but the form that to them seems most desirable and profitable. The physician is never in doubt as to his place and function in organized society. He has certain specific work to do, and if he prefers to specialize on some particular

part of that work, society has no criticisms to offer. The lawyer has his place and work. The engineer has clearly defined duties. The minister alone among professional men finds himself pulled hither and thither by a multitude of conflicting duties imposed upon him by a society that has no clear conception of either the place or the function of the minister in society.

For this distraction, society as a whole is not primarily nor chiefly to blame. The ministers themselves have created it, and are perpetuating it. The young man leaving the theological seminary to take up the work in his first charge knows that he cannot possibly do everything that every other minister is doing. With honest and open mind he goes to his ministerial brethren for advice. One assures him that his first duty is that of a prophet declaring with a "thus saith the Lord" the whole counsel of God. The next points out the course of an engineer constructing ecclesiastical machinery, the running of which will keep every member of the church busy and, consequently, out of mischief. A third advises the Sunday School and the Young People's Society as the most important sphere of work. While the fourth is sure that "the great mission of the church is missions." Another is convinced that the institutional church and the social settlement is the form the Kingdom of God must take in the immediate future, while still another believes that the one great work of the preacher of to-day is the intellectual work of harmonizing religious and secular knowledge. But there are not lacking ministers now in the field who are by no means certain in their own minds as to the essential duty of a minister's life and work. These grasp each new fad, and furnish the eager following for the ecclesiastical promoter of new wonders, new societies, new organizations, new movements which meteor-like flash across the ecclesiastical sky, to dazzle for a while by their brilliance and leave stygian darkness of the spirit in their wake. Society is by no means agreed as to what it has a right to expect of the minister, and the ministry of to-day is by no means agreed as to the essential

service to be offered to society. Is it any wonder that the young minister is puzzled to find his place and function in organized society?

In the redivision of labors in the social organism within the past half century the demands upon the minister's time, interest and support have increased in geometrical ratio, until the minister of to-day finds it absolutely impossible even to undertake all that society, his fellow workers and his own ideal would thrust upon him. If the minister of the gospel by virtue of his ordination were equipped with two or three brains instead of one with which to grapple with the innumerable intellectual problems that try the faith of men; two or three hearts with which to sympathize with all the woes, real and imaginary, which vex the souls of men, women and children; two or three pairs of legs—for he cannot afford other conveyance—with which to carry his hearts and brains to all the points of contact with human life; two or three tongues with which to speak to all classes and conditions of men, on every conceivable subject;—if the minister had all these, and with them all, the physical strength of a Sandow, the calm patience of a Lincoln, the manysidedness of a Roosevelt and the executive ability of a Bismarck, he might, in some sort of fashion, meet all the demands made upon the minister of to-day. Failing in this endowment, to attempt them all must inevitably lead to failure in all, and to physical, mental, moral and spiritual bankruptcy.

In every other calling and profession, the development of a complex social organism has led to a division of labor, and a narrowing of the sphere of activity. But the ministry has persistently held to every function ever performed by those holding the ministerial office, and added from generation to generation duty after duty until to-day the minister has no clearly defined place in society. The light-minded may rejoice in "the limitless horizon of the ministerial office." But the serious man knows that the dissipation of energy is sinful waste. If the personality of a man is to count for anything in

this world, it must come into vital contact with life at some one place. The countless activities that any other man might perform equally well give the minister no claim to a place in organized society. If he is to have and keep a place he must find the one thing that no one but a minister of Jesus Christ can do. And when he has found it, he must abide in it. What is that one thing which no one but a minister can do, and which if well done will put the minister at least on a par with the surgeon and the corporation lawyer as an indispensable member of human society?

It is in vain that we search the history of the priesthood or prophetism of Israel to find an answer to this question, if we look only at the external side of their activities. The government in Israel was a theocracy. The church and state were one. The priest was both religious leader and sanitation officer. The prophet was preacher and statesman in one. Neither the Apostolic church nor the Reformation of the sixteenth century can furnish the norm for present day activities. Neither Aaron nor Isaiah, neither Paul nor Augustine, neither Luther nor Calvin can be taken as the perfect type for the minister of today. The social organization has undergone an almost complete transformation since any of them lived. Church and state have been separated. Religion and medicine have been divorced. Division and subdivision of labor and responsibilities has accompanied the evolution of society. The minister of the gospel is no longer the only servant of the Christ who labors for the coming of His Kingdom. The minister of healing lives and works and sacrifices in the person of the Christian doctor. The minister of justice lives in the Christian lawyer, the Christian judge and the Christian policeman. The Christian poor director in the Christian state in large measure takes the place of the deacon in the Apostolic church. The free public school, planned by Christian statesmen, and taught by Christian teachers relieves the minister of much of his former responsibility for the education of the young. The lodge and the life insurance company, both products of

Christian society, are doing a beneficent work, which the Apostolic church tried to do and failed, because in the very nature of the case the church could not black-ball the unworthy or exclude the unfit. The workshops and manual training schools offer wide scope for the development of industrial efficiency. The avenues for play and recreation are already far too many rather than too few for the good of the people. Into none of these spheres of activity is there any imperative call for the Christian minister to enter. The organization of society has placed responsibility for these things into other hands. When the minister leaves his own sphere to enter these, he not only neglects his own more important work, he also convicts himself of overweening presumption.

But if we look more closely at the work of Jewish or Roman priest, prophet or protestant preacher, we find one central motive, one primary and essential activity in all their work. They lived and worked that they might bring God and man together into personal relation and fellowship. Jesus Christ came into the world that men "might have life and have it more abundantly." "And this is eternal life, to know Thee the living and true God, and Jesus the Christ whom Thou hast sent." To save men from sin and fit them for eternal life, by winning men through that one exhibition of divine love in Christ was, and is the one eternal purpose of God. To establish a Kingdom of God on earth, in which God's will should be done on earth as in heaven, not a kingdom of this world, not a kingdom of earthly powers and forces, nor even of external form like that of political states to be observed of men, but a kingdom of the spirit in the hearts of men was the end for which Jesus lived, worked and died. The unfinished work of Jesus is left for the Christian minister of today. As in the apostolic church, as in the sixteenth century, so today the one all important work of the Christian minister is to bring man into intelligent, loving, vital, personal relation with God in Christ and keep him there. No other work in all the world is so fundamental or important as this. No other duty can claim

precedence over it. Organized society at the present day needs no other service as it needs this.

The one true sphere of the Christian minister is the church. And to the people committed to his care by the church, whether few or many, the minister must be first of all a man of God, an expert who knows the truth of God and can impart it. And that he may impart this truth, he must know the fundamental mood, the science and philosophy of the age in which he lives. In an age of clashing interests such as ours, he must be able to strike the full, clear note of assurance and make men hear the voice of God above the din and discord. He must be able to construct for himself and others a theodicy that will quicken and deepen in all hearts the assurance of the being, the perfection, and government of God, and the immortality of the soul. It is his to lead in the path of righteousness and to teach others to follow in that way. A personal friend of the Christ, it is his privilege to introduce others into that prized fellowship with Him. Because he knows and loves God as his Father, he loves all men as brethren. In this is, and forever must be, the mainspring of the Christian's loyalty to the church and his activity in the cause of missions. Above all else the minister of our generation needs to be a man of faith, able to catch, and to help others to catch, above the noise and clamor and confusion and fire and smoke of the world's maddening activities, above the crashing and the grinding of the wheels, and the wheels within wheels of modern invention, above and o'erruling the brutal passions and mistaken zeal of men, a vision of God in His heaven, giving assurance that all's well with His world. In a world that worships the grandeur of wealth and the power of mighty organizations, he must learn, and teach others to learn, that it is "not by might and not by power but by my spirit saith the Lord"; that the God who is not in the lightning, the tempest and the earthquake yet lives and speaks in a still small voice to the hearts of humble, trustful men. In short, the one great work a fair division has put upon the Christian minister in

modern organized society is the one all-important duty of quickening and keeping alive in the hearts of men, women and children, the consciousness of the abiding presence of a living, loving, personal God.

Though church and state are separated and the statesman's duty of the prophet is no longer his, it is yet his privilege to inspire statesmen with a love of divine justice and order. Though the minister has given up the healing function of the apostles he may yet inspire the Christian doctor in the name and spirit of the Christ to perform miracles of healing. Though the public school relieves him of what was once a part of his labors, it is still his duty to teach the teacher to see in each out-cast child, one of the little ones for whom Christ died. God has a message of truth and the inspiration of His love and sympathy for every honest worker in the world, and it is the minister's duty to interpret that message and impart that inspiration. Though the church is or ought to be the all-embracing sphere of the minister's activity, yet through the church, and in the foolishness of preaching, he ought to touch and influence all spheres of human life, bring aid and encouragement to every worthy cause, comfort and cheer to every sinning, suffering son of man.

Called to this high place in human society, fitted for such exalted service to men, the minister has far too often, Martha-like, busied himself with many cares, forgetting the one thing needful. And it is exactly that better part, the part that Mary chose, the part of intimate spiritual fellowship with the Christ, that a distressed church in a distressed world needs in this twentieth century. We need to stop our scheming and our machinery building to sit and listen until we learn to love the accents of the Master's voice, until piety and reverence are born anew in our hearts, until we learn again that art of worship which brings us into vital touch with the living and life-giving God. We need to read again the gospel stories of our Lord, and while we need not pattern after all the things he did in a society widely different from our own, we may catch the

spirit of that glorious ministry of his and make it the spirit of our own. We may, when tempted to adopt socialism or some other panacea for the ills of the economic world, as a substitute for the gospel, read again how He replied to one who came asking his interference in temporal affairs: "Who made me a divider over you?" And when power seems the one thing needful in a world of sin, we may remember that in an equally sinful world he used force but once, and that was to drive from the temple dedicated to the worship of God, those who tried to commercialize their religion. We need to read anew how he dealt with publicans and sinners that we may learn that the minister's true appeal is to the conscience, not to the legislature. We need to study anew that wonderful record of his temptation in the wilderness that when we are tempted to secure the attention and support of the crowd by ministering to the bodies of men, by furnishing a show to attract men or by using the military methods of a Cæsar or the corporation methods of "big business," we may remember that to do the will of God is more important than to succeed.

True the Christian lives in a sinful world, and as long as it is a sinful world he must work and fight to make it better. Religion is no religion if it does not issue in moral endeavor. The Christian legislator, judge, policeman, doctor, lawyer, school teacher, merchant, hotel-keeper, farmer, mechanic or laborer; the Christian worker in the Law and Order Society, the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty, the Grand Army of the Republic or the Boy Scouts, all have their specific duties in the performance of which they continue to "work out their own salvation with fear and trembling with God working in them to will and to do of His good pleasure." But if the doctor, for example, in addition to a little doctoring attempts to dabble in the work of all the others, he will inevitably make a failure of his life. It is the doctor's duty working with God to keep the bodies of other men fit for the strenuous duties of their several labors; and it is the far more important duty of the minister working with God, to keep the souls of men fit

for the far more strenuous moral work of the world. Granted, that the world needs reformation in politics, in economics, in social life, in industry, in amusements, and in charities, what can be gained if the minister neglects his more important work for these? What shall it profit society, if it gain the highest civilization, the most perfect economic adjustment, the acme of judicial administration, the pinnacle of culture and refinement, and lose its life in God?

True it may at times be necessary that a minister lay aside his duties for others. In the great crises of life, crises that call the lawyer from his brief, the doctor from his sick folk, the banker from his money and the farmer from his plow, it may be necessary for the minister to sell his cloak and buy a sword. A minister is a man, generally a husband and a father, always a citizen of the community, the state and the nation. He has lower duties as well as higher. But his place in organized society and his usefulness therein depends upon the higher, not the lower. Jesus recognized his lower duties and fulfilled them as a man. He also recognized the duty of the crisis and always met that duty. Notwithstanding the fact that he refused to turn the stones of the wilderness into bread, when the multitude was starving he fed them from the five barley loaves and the two small fishes. And the next day that same crowd forsook him, grumbling, because he did not continue to feed them. Notwithstanding that he refused to gratify the hunger for the spectacular by jumping from the pinnacle of the temple, he did make a show to draw all men to himself, when he hung on the cross of Calvary. Notwithstanding the fact that he refused to grasp the kingdoms of this world and the power and the glory of them, by imitating the methods of kings and using the machinery of organization then in vogue, he did send forth his disciples as "sheep in the midst of wolves" to gather men into the unseen kingdom where God rules in the hearts of men. And those same disciples, when the number of followers began to increase greatly, began that very division of labor that has continued with multiplied re-

division down to our own times. For they reckoned thus: "It is not reason that we should leave the word of God to serve tables. Wherefore, brethren, look ye out among you seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business. But we will give ourselves continually to prayer and to the ministry of the word." If it was necessary in the comparatively primitive society of the first century, that certain men should give themselves wholly to prayer and the ministry of the word, without added duty, how much more important in the highly complex and specialized organization of present day society that there be men who will give themselves wholly to this one fundamental service? If it was not reason that the first ministers in the church of Jesus Christ should continue to distribute alms among the poor, how far from reason is it that a minister of today should have his time and strength taken by the innumerable tasks thrust upon him within and without the church of today? Other men, "full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom," often a wisdom surpassing that of the minister, may well look after economic and social, humanitarian and ethical affairs. But if the world is to have men in the next generation, "full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom" to carry on the great work of the world and the church, the minister must stick to his work and give himself continually to the one duty of keeping alive the consciousness of a living God and man's kinship with Him.

Two things prevent the minister of today from taking his rightful place in society and performing his one all-important service to humanity. The first, which I have already discussed, is the insistent and almost irresistible demand that comes from society, that the minister shall do the thousand and one other, more or less important things, that custom, or the weakness of the ministry itself, have fastened on the profession. Of these the more important belong rightfully to the Christian laymen, the less important, yet more harassing and insistent, should be relegated to the scrap heap of obsolete practices.

The other obstacle to an effective and rational ministry, which I have already hinted at, is the tendency of the age to mechanical invention as it obtains in the social sphere. Ours is an age of organization, and the amalgamation of organizations. Each new idea born, each new method devised, calls for a new organization with a constitution, by laws, a program and a full complement of officers. And if the matter in the faintest degree concerns religion or morals, the minister is expected to furnish the power and the lubricant to run the new machine. If he refuses or remains neutral he is classed as a "back number," a "fossil," a "kicker" and a "knocker." And if, perchance, a good and useful organization exists, as the Sunday School, for example, it is forthwith made to be interdenominational, and international, linked up with the county, the state and the nation instead of the congregation, has thrust upon it so many standards of so-called efficiency, is furnished with so many tawdry helps, banners, devices and phony jewelry, that the primary purpose of leading the child to know the revelation of God in Christ, and to realize his own personal relation to his loving, heavenly Father is largely lost sight of. Ours is the age of big things, big visions, big schemes, big combinations, big movements—big talk. Long ago, the Greeks tell us, the giants piled Ossa on Pelion and leafy Olympus on both to scale the abode of the gods. And away back in the days of the childhood of the race, they who dwelt in the land of Shinar said one to another: "Go to, let us make brick, and burn them thoroughly. And they had brick for stone and slime had they for mortar. And they said, Go to, let us build us a city and a tower whose top may reach unto heaven; and let us make us a name lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth." And yet once more in this twentieth century will the puny giants pile church on church, denomination on denomination, and again will they pile their half baked organizations and societies in heaps and bind them with the slime of sentiment as a substitute for the cement of faith, that they may take the kingdom of heaven by

force, and set times and seasons for Him who is eternal. Far wiser, far better acquainted with the way and will of God, far more worthy our emulation as a preacher, though the Jews rejected his counsel, was that Isaiah who declared, "Thus saith the Lord God, the Holy One of Israel: in returning and rest shall ye be saved, in quietness and confidence shall be your strength"; and again: "He that believeth shall not make haste."

It is this tendency, both in the church and outside of it, to emphasize schemes, plans and efforts, humanitarian or ethical, to the exclusion of the one thing truly needful, that makes it so difficult for the minister of today to find his rightful place, and render his important service in the organized society of today. The lure of the supposedly practical, and the idolatry of bigness have caused us to forget, that the true work of God is a work in the heart of man, that the agent is the Holy Spirit, and that God's minister is a man of Christ-like mold who gives his life that he may lead a few of God's children into the way of the more abundant life. To the many who reject his services he may continue to be a mere parasite on organized society, a man who renders no service worth having. Even in the twentieth century of the Christian era he may be forced to share the fate of a Roger Williams, a Savonarola, a Huss of Bohemia or a Jesus on his cross. But to the few who through him come to know God in Christ, a living, loving personal God, who saves from the guilt and power of sin,—learn to know what is the fellowship of the Spirit and are led by that Spirit into the service of humanity in the name of Christ; to these and others like them who have tasted the joy of divine life through the ministry of the gospel of Christ, the minister is the most important member in all organized society. The service he renders is the greatest of all services, and the place they gladly give him is the place next to that filled by the Son of God.

POTTSVILLE, PA.

IV.

IS WALT WHITMAN THE BEST REPRESENTATIVE OF AMERICA'S INDEPENDENT SPIRIT IN POETRY?

EDWARD S. BROMER.

It is evident from the statement of the subject that our emphasis must rest on the words "America's independent spirit in poetry." It is not, therefore, the question, Is Walt Whitman the best representative of the spirit of American poetry? Poetry always reflects the influence of nature, the mind of the past, and the quickening present consciousness of life in action. In this way it may well be claimed that the chief American poets, generally so-called, like Lowell, Whittier, Longfellow, Emerson, etc., in their broad culture involving the European ideals and classical forms of ancient Greece and Rome are truly typical of the American spirit in poetry. This we are willing in a measure to admit. But when you approach the question suggested above we must face the proposition that Walt Whitman is or is not the best representative of America's *independent* spirit of poetry.

We may further note that in thinking of the independent spirit of American poetry we do not mean, even in Whitman, to find that which is entirely new and strange and divorce it from the inheritance of all the best from past ages and foreign lands; for, his own contention was that the true American spirit meant to utilize just those very elements of the past and of foreign lands, but in a sense and power, original and indigenous to the very soil, atmosphere, ideals, struggles and spirit of our common everyday American individual and national living.

This is the contention of Emerson's noted address on *The American Scholar*. "The scholar is that man who must take up into himself all the ability of the time, all the contribution of the past, all the hopes of the future. He must be an university of knowledges. If there be one lesson more than another, which should pierce his ear, it is, The world is nothing, the man is all, in yourself is the law of all nature, and you know not yet how a globule of sap ascends; in yourself slumbers the whole of reason; it is for you to know all, it is for you to dare all. Mr. President and Gentlemen; this confidence in the unsearched might of man belongs, by all motives, by all prophecy, by all preparation to the American scholar. We have listened too long to the courtly muses of Europe. The spirit of American freeman is already suspected to be timid, imitative, tame. Public and private avarice makes the air we breathe thick and fat. The scholar is decent, indolent, complaisant. . . .

"Not so, brothers and friends—please God, ours shall not be so. We will walk on our own feet, we will work with our own hands, we will speak our own minds. The study of letters shall be no longer a name for pity, for doubt, and for sensual indulgence. The dread of man and the love of man shall be a wall of defence and a wreath of joy around all. A nation of men will for the first time exist, because each believes himself inspired by the Divine Soul which also inspires all men."

Prof. C. H. Page, of Columbia, declares that Whitman's work is the logical outcome of this address of Emerson on *The American Scholar*. In this several other critics of note agree. Emerson himself wrote to Whitman at the first appearance of *Leaves of Grass*: "I am not blind to the worth of the wonderful gift of *Leaves of Grass*. I find it the most extraordinary piece of wit and wisdom that America has yet produced. I am happy in reading it, as great power makes us happy. . . . I greet you at the beginning of a great career."

Speaking of the beginnings of a real democratic art in literature A. J. Symonds says, "Up to the present moment there are but few signs of any vital resurrection of the spirit. Not

only in Europe but in America also, culture continues to be mainly reproductive and imitative. The conflict of romanticism liberated taste; yet artists still handle worn-out themes in the old formal ways, without the earlier grasp upon them, without fervor of conviction, and without power to awake popular enthusiasm. So far as I am aware, only one living author has approached the problem with a full sense of its present urgency and ultimate preponderance. I allude to Walt Whitman, whose whole life has been employed in attempting to lay foundations for a new national literature."

Without taking pains to array other authorities, we at once see that our problem is a pivotal one and whether we will or not Walt Whitman, as a great independent force in American literature, must be fully considered. John Burroughs says, near the close of his volume on Whitman, "After what I have already said, my reader will not be surprised when I tell him that I look upon Whitman as the one mountain thus far in our literary landscape."

Fundamental in my whole experience with Whitman is one of Emerson's central principles; for, by the way, Whitman is New England Transcendentalism written large and brought down from the skies to the earth. This central Emersonian principle is that "I only know as I have lived." The great fundamental necessity of individuality and freedom is that we live at first-hand with God, nature and man. Here is exactly the significance of my experience with Walt Whitman. I approached him with prejudices; I soon studied him with sympathy; I was gripped with his ruling ideas; I had to shake myself thoroughly and straighten up to get my bearings; I could not at last follow him but my vision of things can never again be quite the same as before I met him. He made me think of living at first-hand with nature and so with myself as a man, at first hand with my fellowmen and at first-hand with God. In other words he leads into a bold individualism, an intense democracy and a broad religion. In each of these directions the independent spirit of America finds free expres-

sion in him as a poet. We are impressed and amazed at the audacity of his faith and his unconquerable persistence in it to the end.

I. First let us consider his power to make us live at first-hand with nature and thus with oneself. Almost everything in Whitman may be resolved to a simple theme—his reliance upon absolute nature.

“Creeds and schools in abeyance
Retiring back awhile, sufficed at what they
are, but never forgotten,
I harbor for good or bad
I permit to speak at every hazard,
Nature without check, with original energy.”

That he permitted nature without check with original energy to speak in his own life is not to be questioned. In body and personality he was a most remarkable man. He believed in all the simple, natural, primal elements that make a man. His doctrine of identity made him ally man with all there is and was. He stood on the basis of modern science. He used it not for material but for inspiration. He seems to be an immaterial pantheist and yet he makes everything tell for the individual and personality. In the consciousness of man he finds the equal of all the great discoveries and deductions of science in outer nature. His *Leaves of Grass* is the outgrowth of science and modern ideas, as truly as Dante is the outgrowth of mediæval ideas and superstitions, or as Shakespeare is the expression of Feudalism. Nowhere among all our American poets have we such audacity of faith in man as natural man as in Walt Whitman.

What I want to emphasize here is his bold assertion of man as man. He celebrates manly pride, self-reliance, the deliciousness of sex; he glorifies the body, the natural appetites, nativity; he identifies himself with all human life good and bad. All is good. Man is divine inside and outside, no more so about the head than about the loins. Let conventions and refinements stand back and let nature speak. The artificiality and insincerity of modern society with its infanticide, its

growing race suicide must needs learn anew the glory, sanctity and meaning of primal manhood and womanhood. Neither the restrictions, denials and safeguards with which the social order bind us, nor the dictates of a worldly prudence can ever redeem humanity. A greater man and woman, a still more fervid humanism, and a still more vehement love are demanded to purge the stream of life.

"I announce a man or woman coming—perhaps you are the one,
(So long!)

I announce the greatest individual, fluid as Nature, chaste, affectionate,
compassionate, fully armed.

I announce a life that shall be copious, vehement, spiritual, bold;

I announce an end that shall lightly and joyfully meet its translation;

I announce myriads of youths, beautiful, gigantic, sweet-blooded;

I announce a race of splendid and savage old men."

What is usually attributed to Whitman's egotism and sensualism is, in fact, his emphasis of the primal elements of man as man. His *Leaves of Grass* reminds us much of the early primitive literature of the race. There is nothing of the Byronic note of lust and passion in him. He never celebrates the erotic spirit. As we study Whitman deeper, we feel once more the Edenic naturalness and goodness of man as man. No poet has ever so transported me into the elemental feelings of my youth; when the springs of life were new and fresh, when the secret, inner stirrings of manhood first came, when the sense of sex was paramount, when movement meant grace, speed and agility, when ideals mounted the clouds, when sympathetic comradeship was a passion, when everything was religious. None of our poets so made me feel that he who degrades the body degrades the soul. None has made the modern social sin so heinous with its corruptions and its barrenness, its inability to multiply and be fruitful, to replenish the earth and subdue it. No other of our poets has so made me feel the true place of sex in nature, nationality, and democracy. Man and woman are equal. Together and only together are they progenitors of the race. Stripped of the con-

ventions of society and empty prudishness, in the nakedness of elemental, primal, natural, divine manhood and womanhood, they must more and more live, work, mature, multiply and die and live again.

Nowhere in American literature do we find such an assertion of independence of creeds and traditions with reference to man as simply man.

II. In the second place let us consider how he brings us into first-hand touch with our fellowmen and lays the foundations of democracy.

It is generally a mistake to attribute the egotism and apparent sensuality of Whitman to himself as a man. He represents the Democratic man in the free assertion of his being. He is the type. He is in touch with all classes and conditions, good and bad, rich and poor. He lives and glories in them all. But he lives in them *en masse*. It is the whole people together.

“One's-Self I sing—a simple, separate Person;
Yet utter the word Democratic, the word *en masse*.
Of Physiology from top to toe I sing;
Not physiognomy alone, nor brain alone, is worthy for the muse
—I say the Form complete is worthier far;
The female equally with the male I sing.

Of Life immense in passion, pulse, and power,
Cheerful—for freest action form'd, under the laws divine,
The Modern Man I sing.

I am the credulous man of qualities, ages, races;
I advance from the people in their own spirit;
Here is what sings unrestricted faith.”

Upon the great fundamental human interests he founds Democracy. Man as man, woman as woman, together are humanity. Social equality is paramount. Comradeship is above sex-love. It is the bond of states and the republic of the world.

“Come, I will make the continent indissoluble;
I will make the most splendid race the sun ever yet shone upon;
I will make divine magnetic lands,
With the love of comrades,
With the life-long love of comrades.

352 *Is Walt Whitman the Best Representative of*

I will plant companionship thick as trees along the rivers of America,
and 'long the shores of the Great Lakes, and all over the prairies;
I will make inseparable cities, with their arms around each others' necks;
By the love of comrades,
By the manly love of comrades.

For you these, from me, O Democracy, to serve you, *ma femme*!
For you! for you, I am trilling these songs,
In the love of comrades,
In the high towering love of comrades."

Many critics see in Whitman the first real giant of the democratic spirit in literature. I confess I could not read him without feeling the cosmic greatness of the individual man and the cosmic oneness of the human race with nature and God. He cannot be understood except in the light of the culmination of modern science interpreted in terms of man and human relations. Other democratic poets are lost in the cosmic setting of Whitman's poetry. The Divine Average, or the average man, speaks in him in clearer tones than in any other poet of the race. He calmly sets aside caste, culture, privileges and royalties. New standards are set. Everything is seen from the human and democratic point of view.

He is so confident of the triumph of American democracy that he declares openly that he uses America and Democracy as interchangeable terms. In one of his prose essays he says, "The United States is destined to surmount the gorgeous history of Feudalism or else prove the most stupendous failure of time." He recognizes that whilst America advances to a commanding position in wealth and strength and all material qualities of national greatness, a literature corresponding to her democracy has not yet appeared. The basis of such a literature he hopes to lay. In his assertion of America's independent spirit in poetry no one has been so audacious and none has come so near fulfilling his faith.

His democracy is intensely patriotic and American but it is continental too. His foundations are as broad as humanity, nature and God. John Burroughs writes of him in this respect as follows:

"We must look for the origin of Whitman in the deep world-currents that have been shaping the destiny of the race for the past hundred years or more; in the universal loosening, freeing, and renewing of obstructions; in the emancipation of the people, and their coming forward and taking possession of the world in their own right; in the downfall of kingcraft and priestcraft; the growth of individualism and non-conformity; the increasing disgust of the soul of man with forms and ceremonies; the sentiment of realism and positiveness; the religious hunger that flees the churches; the growing conviction that life, that nature, are not failures, that the universe is good, that man is clean inside and outside, that God is immanent in nature,—all these things and more lie back of Whitman, and hold a causal relation to him."

The advent of the people is the great characteristic of the past century. Richard Wagner wrote his litanies of the future in the turmoil of the revolutions of 1848. At one place he cries out "Who is to be the artist of the future? The poet? The actor? The musician? The sculptor? Let us put it in one word: The People." Prof. Francis C. Gummere in a recent book, *Democracy and Poetry*, writes the following significant words about the poet of democracy. "It is a democrat of the western world who undertook to voice the people, to transcribe the age, to hail the ventures of new thought, science, the whole rush and roar of things and so chant with a will the litany of all ages and places." And Blake's oracular record, "Poetry fettered, fetters the human race," heard or felt in mysterious communication of spirit to spirit, heartened this poet of the western world to be his own law of verse. What Chenier half planned to do, in exquisite proportion and harmonious rhythm, was now done with freedom from all bonds of form, and in the largest possible bulk, by the most conspicuously seen, the most hotly praised, and heartily flouted poet of all the mortal list. World and life and time spoke through Walt Whitman. And we cannot evade the question:

"Was Whitman the real poet of the people, the ultimate expression of true democracy in art?"

Was he the real poet of democracy is not quite the same question as the one before us—Was he the best representative of America's independent spirit in poetry? Here again we would have to assert that he is the boldest democrat American literature has produced. We need to note, however, that he embraces good and evil in the mass here, in national, as in his sense of individual life. He lays hold of the positive expansive elements of democracy and life and becomes the unfaltering optimist of his age.

The democracy of Whitman is manifest in the themes and content of his work. Emerson in the *American Scholar* has this striking paragraph, with reference to one of the auspicious signs of the times:

"One of these signs is the fact that the same movement which effected the elevation of what was called the lowest class in the state, assumed in literature a very marked and as benign an aspect. Instead of the sublime and beautiful, the near, the low, the common, was explored and poetized. That which had been negligently trodden under foot by those who were harnessing and provisioning themselves for long journeys into far countries, is suddenly found to be richer than all foreign parts. The literature of the poor, the feelings of the child, the philosophy of the street, the meaning of household life, are the topics of the time. It is a great stride. It is a sign—is it not?—of new vigor when the extremities are made active, when currents of warm life run into the hands and the feet. I ask not for the great, the remote, the romantic; what is doing in Italy and Arabia, what is Greek art, or Provençal minstrelsy; I embrace the common, I explore and sit at the feet of the familiar, the low. Give me insight into today, and you may have the antique and future worlds. What would we really know the meaning of? The meal in the firkin; the milk in the pan; the ballad in the street; the news of the boat; the glance of the eye; the form and the gait of the body;—show me the

ultimate reason of these matters; show me the sublime presence of the highest spiritual cause lurking, as always it does lurk, in these suburbs and extremities of nature; let me see every trifle bristling with the polarity that ranges it instantly on an eternal law; and the shop, the plough, and the ledger referred to the like cause by which light undulates and poets sing;—and the world lies no longer a dull miscellany and lumber-room, but has form and order; there is no trifle, there is no puzzle, but one design unites and animates the farthest pinnacle and the lowest trench.”

These are the elements the people must furnish to the poet of democracy. These the classical and feudal forms and their derivatives have scarcely touched, much less worked out. These are the themes of Whitman. The heroes of classic myth and history, the chivalry of the armed knight of feudal times, the high-born honor and loyalty of the royal blood of monarchic days, the passionate friendship of cultured spirits,—all these spring up new-born among the masses. They are no longer the property only of the privileged classes. The average man lives in all the graces of high thinking, true living and real rulership and service. The engine-driver steering his train at night over perilous viaducts, the life-boat man, the member of the fire brigade assailing houses toppling to their ruin among the flames; these are found to be no less heroic than heroes of classic love or of idealized history. It is the same with the chivalrous respect for womanhood and weakness, with comradeship uniting men in brotherhood, with passion fit for tragedy, with beauty shedding light on human habitations. They no longer dwell afar in antique fable or dim mediæval legend. The plumed knight, the royal palace, the gartered gentry in all their best and worst now live in life and song, the incarnation of the people.

“What is commonest, cheapest, nearest, easiest, is Me,
Me going in for my chances, spending for vast returns,
Adorning myself to bestow myself on the first that will take me,
Not asking the sky to come down to my good will,
Scattering it freely forever.

The pure contralto sings in the organ loft,
 The carpenter dresses his plank—the tongue of his foreplane whistles its
 wild ascending lisp,
 The married and unmarried children ride home to their Thansgiving
 dinner,
 The pilot seizes the king-pin—he heaves down with a strong arm,
 The mate stands braced in the whale-boat—lance and harpoon are ready,
 The duck-shooter walks by silent and cautious stretches,
 The deacons are ordained with crossed hands at the altar,
 The spinning-girl retreats and advances to the hum of the big wheel,
 The farmer stops by the bars, as he walks on a First Day loafe, and
 looks at the oats and the rye,
 The lunatic is carried at last to the asylum, a confirmed case,
 He will never sleep any more as he did in the cot in his mother's bedroom;
 The jour printer with gray head and gaunt jaws works at his ease,
 He turns his quid of tobacco, while his eyes blurr with the manuscript;
 The malformed limbs are tied to the anatomist's table,
 What is removed drops horribly in a pail;
 The quadroon girl is sold at the stand—the drunkard nods by the bar-
 room stove,
 The machinist rolls up his sleeves—the policeman travels his beat—the
 gatekeeper marks who pass,
 The young fellow drives the express wagon—I love him though I do not
 know him,
 The half-breed straps on his light boots to compete in the race," etc.

Indeed one must read Whitman through and through to feel how he has invested the people with the noblest and best, the ignoblest and worst of human life. It is the very spirit of democracy in its triumphant and optimistic mood to claim everything. But more is implied in this viewpoint. "There is a new and more deeply religious way of looking at mankind, a gradual triumph after so many centuries of the spirit which is Christ's, an enlarged faculty of piercing below externals and appearances to the truth and essence of things. God, the divine, is recognized as immanent in nature, and in the soul and body of humanity; not external to these things, not conceived of as creative from outside, or incarnated in any single personage, but as all-pervasive, all-constitutive, everywhere and in all."

Such a philosophy of democracy demanded its own art-form of expression. Here again Whitman was equal to the demand. Here his own declaration:

"In paths untrodden,
In the growth of margins of the pond-waters,
Escaped from the life that exhibits itself,
From all the standards hitherto published—from the pleasures, profits,
eruditions, conformities,
Which too long I was offering to feed my soul;
Clear to me now, standards not yet published—clear to me that my Soul,
That the Soul of the man I speak for, feeds, rejoices most in Comrades."

So he would declare that the new democratic art must be a speaking and being understood as comrades.

Shakespeare as the feudal priest of literature put poetry only in the mouths of kings and queens and nobles and lords and ladies and aspiring wits. Servants speak in prose. The common herd bawl or halloa or simply talk. The classic unities of the drama are violated; classic forms of poetry are ignored and Shakespeare long was counted a heretic in literature. But even as he delivered his age from the bondage of classic forms so today the demands of democratic art deliver us from the bondage of the feudal period, and the Shakespearian way of voicing human nature. Lo, the people have found a voice in poetry! Whitman claims to be their herald. His work is neither prose nor poetry according to accepted standards of poetic form, and yet after its kind it is poetry most real and true. The result of the conflict between Romanticism with Classicism has been such as to deliver us to freedom. The man of letters in democracy has the privilege of this freedom. Whitman demanded it and gave expression to himself and democracy in a poetic form all his own.

His strange broken verse, his cataloguing habit, his crudity of figure, his abruptness,—all have a bad effect on the cultured ears of classic critics. But despite the storm of abuse and ostracism no latter day students refuse Walt Whitman a high place in American literature. We cannot here go into a study of his verse or measured prose as you may choose to call it. It is sufficient to say that democratic art has at least begun to take form and Walt Whitman marks the beginning of an epoch.

III. Let us now, in the third place, briefly turn to his power

to make us feel a first-hand touch with God in nature and in human life.

The two points which we have already had in mind were individualism and democracy. The third is religion. We can in no way introduce it better than by quoting somewhat at length one of his finer passages.

"Each is not for its own sake;

I say the whole earth, and all the stars in the sky, are for Religion's sake.

I say no man has ever yet been half devout enough;

None has ever yet adored or worship'd half enough;

None has begun to think how divine he himself is, and how certain the future is.

I say that the real and permanent grandeur of These States must be their own religion;

Otherwise there is no real and permanent grandeur:

(Nor character, nor life worthy the name, without religion;

Nor land, nor man, nor woman, without Religion.)

What are you doing young man?

Are you so earnest—so given up to literature, science, art, amours?

These ostensible realities, politics, points?

Your ambition or business, whatever it may be?

It is well—Against such I say not a word—I am their poet also;

But behold! such swiftly subside—burnt up for Religion's sake;

For not all matter is fuel to heat, impalpable flame, the essential life of the earth,

Any more than such are to Religion.

What do you seek, so pensive and silent?

What do you need, Camerado?

Dear son! do you think it is love?

Listen, dear son—listen, America, daughter or son!

It is a painful thing to love a man or woman to excess—and yet it satisfies—it is great;

But there is something else very great—it makes the whole coincide;

It, magnificent, beyond materials, with continuous hands, sweeps and provides for all.

Know you! solely to drop in the earth the germs of a greater Religion, The following chants, each for its kind, I sing.

My comrades!

For you, to share with me, two greatnesses—and a third one, rising
inclusive and more resplendent,
The greatness of Love and Democracy—and the greatness of Religion.”

Here again we have the boldest assertion of America's independent spirit in poetry. As the individual man stands forth in the nakedness of being and lives toward the fulness of his naturally divine life; as the people in like manner live in the growing greatness of humanity; so man in his religious life is everywhere with God. “God is in all and through all and over all.” Man is his creature and divine through and through. There is no god more sacred than himself. Man is ever a new creation. So-called evil is but a part of the process of his being. Man but needs to know himself as he is to be himself as he ought to be.

At every point he seems to contradict the traditional view of religion. It begins with a curse. Sense of sin, repentance, forgiveness, new life are its processes. Creeds and rituals, priests and confessors are its instruments. Heaven is gained by denying earth. Salvation is in the church, the ark of safety. The majority of mankind are cursed to perdition.

He would begin life with a new song of creation and not a curse. God's work is not a tragedy but a growing consummation. There is no devil whose machinations can ruin the work of infinite being. The whole human attitude toward the universe, toward God, toward life, toward good and evil is changed.

The strange feature of his case is that he lived enthusiastically in his faith and persisted in it buoyantly to the end. He illustrated his democratic religion in which every man is his own creed, priest, and ritual. In the true democracy there will be no need of churches, even as John in Revelation saw the new Jerusalem and said, “I saw no temple therein; for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple thereof.” Only Whitman would not have added “and the Lamb.” Directness of touch with self, nature, fellowmen and God with-

out intervention of any mediators, this is the coming religion of democracy.

Such a faith in life meant a greater faith in death. No poet ever believed more firmly in immortality.

"Great is Life, real and mystical, wherever and whoever;
Great is Death—sure as life holds all parts together, Death holds all
parts together.
Has Life much purport?—Ah, Death has the greater purport."

It was not without deeper meaning that he would speak much of death in his democratic religion.

"'Tis not for nothing, Death,
I sound out you, and words of you, with daring tone—embodying you,
In my new democratic chants—keeping you for a close,
For last impregnable retreat—a citadel and tower,
For my last stand—my pealing, final cry."

*It is forward that we go, not backward when we pass through
the dark narrow gate. We go in the momentum of our living
being too, we are not dead.*

"Forever alive, forever forward,
Stately, solemn, sad, withdrawn, baffled, mad, turbulent, feeble, dis-
satisfied,
Desperate, proud, fond, sick, accepted by men, rejected by men,
They go! they go! I know that they go, but I know not where they go,
But I know that they go toward the best—toward something great."

He loved the ocean as a figure of life and death and life again. He thought of man as the voyager sailing the eternal seas, those seas of time and no time. How beautifully he thinks of the final cruise.

"Now finale to the shore!
Now, land and life, finale, and farewell!
Now Voyager depart! (much, much for thee is yet in store;)
Often enough hast thou adventur'd o'er the seas,
Cautiously cruising, studying the charts,
Duly again to port, and hawser's tie, returning;
—But now obey, thy cherish'd secret wish,
Embrace thy friends—leave all in order;
To port, and hawser's tie, no more returning,
Depart upon your endless cruise, old sailor!"

The haven at last is in sight and who could cry with more evident sense of triumph and bliss—

“Joy! shipmate—joy!
(Pleased to my Soul at death I cry;)
Our life is closed—our life begins;
The long, long anchorage we leave,
The ship is clear at last—she leaps!
She swiftly courses from the shore;
Joy! shipmate—joy!”

We answer our question in the affirmative. Yes, Walt Whitman is the best representative of America's independent spirit in poetry. Others have followed him. The most important are Richard Hovey, Bliss Carmen, and Edwin Markham. Markham is the greatest of these. He is far more of an artist than Whitman but lacks his massive greatness, although his point of view is much the same. There is one great exception, however, and should you ask who the real poet of Democracy thus far in our history is, I might answer Edwin Markham, simply because he fulfills in part the one great negative criticism to be made of Whitman.

A high position in this question has been taken. No man in American literature, not even Poe, was so much loved and hated. None was the occasion of such an abundance of critical literature as he. It is true that whilst he carries us on the bosom of his stream of optimism; he likewise, by the very force of the current, carries us into an eddy of reaction almost as strong and persistent as the forward impulsion of the stream itself. The criticism that ultimately arises comes out of the very heart of his point of view of life. But he must be heard and with him we must reckon. Though you protest and criticise him he would answer you:

“The spotted hawk swoops by and accuses me—he complains of my gab and my loitering.

I too am not a bit tamed—I too am untranslatable;
I sound my barbaric yawp over the roofs of the world.”

In this independent spirit he lived and wrote and would transmit to a new generation the laws of democratic art.

"Laws for Creations,

For strong artists and leaders—for fresh broods of teachers, and perfect
literats for America,

For noble savans and coming musicians.

All must have reference to the ensemble of the world, and the compact
truth of the world;

There shall be no subject too pronounced—All works shall illustrate the
divine law of indirections.

What do you suppose Creation is?

What do you suppose will satisfy the soul, except to walk free and to
own no superior?

What do you suppose I would intimate to you in a hundred ways, but
that man or woman is as good as God?

And that there is no God any more divine than Yourself?

And that that is what the oldest and the newest myths finally mean?

And that you or any one must approach Creations through such laws?"

The one criticism to which reference was just made is central and attacks the very citadel of his point of view. The immediacy of conscious touch for good and progress of men with self, nature, fellowmen, and God is not such as his optimism declares. He does not make sufficient allowance for the immaturity of the race on one hand and its positive sinfulness on the other. He embraces evil freely enough, but he fails to feel it. For him it is only a foil to the good. It is part of the mysterious, dread machinery which is meant to turn out free immortal men and women. He takes the open road to the essentials of human life and optimistically would proclaim the triumph of Democracy. He, with all his optimism, however, is not constructive. He is a seer. His vision evidently is before him, but he gives nothing but the vision, no ways and means, by which to build up the people, to be strong enough to live with him. Henry James in his book entitled, *Varieties of Religious Experience*, speaks of Whitman as one of the prominent representatives of the "religion of healthy mindedness." "Walt Whitman," he says, "owes his importance in literature to the systematic expulsion from his writings of all *contractile* elements. The only sentiments he allowed himself to express were of the expansive order; and he expressed

these in the first person, not as your mere monstrously conceited individual might so express them, but vicariously for all men, so that a passionate and mystic ontological emotion suffuses his words, and ends by persuading the reader that men and women, life and death, and all things are divinely good."

That is it exactly, the "contractible elements" he ignores, the "expansive" he exalts. As a matter of fact with all his sympathy with the common life of man, he fails to touch the secret of their real needs. In our own lives as individuals we all are delighted with a vision of a glorified human body and soul in real life but we must know more than the vision. Complete living involves three great things, first a direction; second, a goal; third, enough life-force to get there. Here is where Whitman fails. Despite his loud egoistic individualism, his philosophy fails to support the individual just at the critical point when moral disaster overtakes the soul.

The same applies to his optimistic view of Democracy. To him America and democracy were not only interchangeable terms but were also synonyms for success and triumph. He knew nothing of the reactionary tendencies of democracy in the last twenty-five years. The polarity of the present political situation, with a reactionary conservatism at one end, and a distrustful socialism at the other, was unknown to him and sufficiently refuted his rosy democratic optimism. A large plutocratic class pleading trusteeship of the great utilities of life and the conservation of the past is becoming very distrustful of the masses and a universal suffrage. Government by commission in various forms, the members of which sometimes are appointed, less often elected, has arisen. Reduction of representation of the people on public boards is called for, etc. Concentration of authority in state and nation is demanded. Distrust of democracy is ripe among the extremely wealthy and the business-holding and money-making middle classes. From the opposite side of the social scale there is even a louder distrust of representative democracy. The Socialists and thousands of laboring men and others not yet

in their ranks are demanding the acts of initiative, referendum and recall to be placed on our statute books. They doubt the practicability of representative democracy in maintaining justice and equality in business and industry. They clamor for the socialization of all the means of communication, travel and trade, the instruments and means of production, the mines and lands. None of these things enter the optimism of Whitman's democracy. It lacks the authority of conservatism, and the orderliness of socialism. It is full of the ego of an extreme individualism and a kind of lawlessness. It is destructive and not constructive. He ignores the problems of ignorance, immaturity and sin in society. He does not meet the necessity of organization and coöperation in social order. His comradeship is a comradeship of individuals who understand each other but not the common problem. A mere declaration of independence does not remove the bondage of selfishness and sin in which men live. He cries out in vain

"Unscrew the locks from the doors;
Unscrew the doors themselves from the jambs."

This can never be done with success now any more than in the days of the French Revolution. In art, in nature, in government, in industry, in religion, the world cannot be built with nothing but centrifugal forces.

Let me, therefore, change the wording of our question: Is Walt Whitman the real poet of American Democracy? I would say no. He is yet to come. In method and spirit Markham is more like this coming poet but he too is not yet this coming one.

All this implies a criticism of Whitman's Democratic Art, both as to form and content. He found expression for his view and in large measure was true to it. His idea of speaking en masse in his own cosmic sort of consciousness for the deeper needs of man is inadequate, far too egoistic and individualistic. As a matter of fact no artist can ever be a law unto himself. He ignores convention and yet convention is

one of the great allies of democracy. "Together" and "co-operation" are its great watchwords. It is this that is wanting in the form and content of Whitman's poetry. His words do not lock-step and his meter lacks harmony. The rhythm of the democratic multitude in peace and industry cannot be heard. It fits the world of war-times but not of peace and progress. The masses never rallied around him. They never will. In war-time he pointed toward a goal. He is not to be despised. His work points both in form and content to the coming one who is really to be the poet of the people.

And just a final word with reference to the mediators of human good. Truth comes to us in mystic, mysterious measure from the cosmic consciousness in which we all live but truth comes likewise through personality and in the upward course and struggle of man there always will be the need of the prophet, priest, and king. With the prophet belong all the ethical seers of all types who would bring the larger vision of life down to man; with the priest belong all who would bring the deep hunger and needs of the human heart upward to God; with the king belong all who are called to be leaders and governors of men in justice, righteousness and love.

These are the great offices of life, created by life and its necessities, in the upward struggle of the race. As long as ignorance, immaturity and sin exist among men, so long will prophets, priests, and kings of the common good be called for service and among them those who are greatest are they who serve most. Times change but man is always man. The form and name of the great offices of human life change but the transmission of truth through personality goes on in reality and essence always and God still gives varying gifts to men. The election to service has always declared the living priests and prophets and kings of men. Walt Whitman's dream of a prophetless, priestless, kingless world is after all but a vision of an impossible Utopia. The days still are when men look for a Son of God who is the mediator of life and teaches them

366 *Is Walt Whitman the Best Representative of*

to live by his guidance at first-hand with God the Eternal Father.

"A people is but the attempt of many
To rise to the completer life of one;
And those who live as models for the mass
Are singly of more value than they all."

When can men cease to look to God's Anointed One, who

"brought fresh stuff
For us to mould, interpret and prove right,—
New feelings fresh from God?"

Somehow conscious, known truth, is truth known only in and through personality. It is always mediated truth. Of the great Mediator, Jesus of Nazareth, we may well say, believing in Him as "the way, the truth, and the life,"

"Then did the form expand, expand—
I knew Him through the dread disguise
As the whole God within His eyes
Embraced me."

GREENSBURG, PA.

V.

THE PLACE OF PAUL IN EARLY CHRISTIANITY.

OSWIN S. FRANTZ.

Religion is by some defined as the "life of God in the soul of man." Christianity is by us regarded as the one true and final religion. It follows therefore that Christianity is a life, and not a mere theory. And as a life it finds its existence in the hearts of men. And as hearts vary, that which lives within tends to vary, *i. e.*, it tends to adapt itself to its surroundings. Christianity, therefore, having passed through many and varied men has been fashioned and moulded by the most representative of the men through whom it has passed. Each forceful life has had its influence upon it. Some of these influences have been of such a marked nature as to be readily distinguished by the observant eye while others have hardly left any mark at all. It is our privilege, then, in studying the Christianity of the present or of any past generation to trace to their sources the various elements found in the Christianity of the period under consideration. This brings us to the task set before us in this paper. We are to determine, if possible, Paul's place in early Christianity, which we understand to mean, Paul's part in the formation and development of Christianity.

Christianity derives its name from Christ, its founder. The life of Jesus, therefore, may be regarded as the first soil in which this new God-life in man had its existence. He is the first one to give it form and shape and character. And to Him must be given the undisputed right of being the founder of Christianity and the source of its life. From Him it reached out into the lives of others. And as this new life entered upon new soil it was obliged to adapt itself to new con-

ditions and naturally appeared in new shapes and forms. Christianity passing from Christ through the hearts and lives of the apostles and Christians of a later day has met with many and varied experiences, some of which have had an evil effect upon it while others have added new life.

Undoubtedly the apostle Paul stands next to Christ as a moulder of Christianity. No other man has left such a marked impress upon the religion of Jesus Christ as the apostle Paul. In passing through Paul Christianity developed into such a form that it could find a home in other than Jewish soil. And in as much as the Gentile world was destined to become the soil in which Christianity was to flourish it is evident that Paul's part in making Christianity a world religion was of the highest importance.

It can readily be seen that the reason why Paul became the greatest contributor to Christianity is to be found in the nature of the task he felt himself called upon to perform. The great work of Paul was to bring Christianity out of Palestine and transplant it among the Greeks and Romans, chief of all civilized people. Jewish Christianity lived apart from the main current of the world's history. It was Paul's part to bring it into the main current, which at that time was running through Greece and Rome. And in order to have Christianity live in this new element it had to undergo changes. As Wernle says, "It had to measure its strength with the religions, the civilization, and the philosophy of the leading nations in the world's history. It had to enter into their needs, their language, and their social intercourse, assuming now a friendly, now a hostile attitude. It was bound to undergo a radical transformation, not merely of external form but of innermost essence. For as a simple community of brethren, believing in the Messiah and obeying the words of Jesus, there was no hope of its enduring in the midst of the civilization of the world" (Vol. I., p. 159). Many of Paul's contributions to Christianity have their source in his trying to make it meet successfully these new conditions.

The apologetic as well as the missionary nature of his work caused a large number of his contributions to Christianity. He was obliged to defend himself and his religion against the attacks of Judaism, on the one hand, and heathenism, on the other. In this noble defense which Paul put up against the attacks of his enemies he brought into prominence certain features of Christianity that might otherwise never have been insisted upon.

But when we say that Paul put new interpretations upon the Gospel of Jesus and perhaps inculcated new ideas into the Christianity of Jesus and the other apostles we must not think that he was disloyal to his Lord and Master. He is not a founder of a new religion, and he did not wish to be accounted such. He was even opposed to the idea of having a Pauline party. "If only Christ be preached," this word which he uttered so earnestly vindicates his loyalty to the Son of God in spite of any foreign contributions he may have added to Christianity. He at all times recognized Christ as his Master, and whatever he did he did with a view of serving Him. So the prominence given to his Christianity over that even of Jesus in the sub-Apostolic Church was unsought on his part. We may agree with Zahn that Paul's teaching was dominant in the sub-Apostolic Church and the pre-Reformation period, but at the same time we can feel assured that Paul sought no such predominance. He wanted Christ to predominate.

THE PERSON OF CHRIST.

Paul's place in early Christianity was determined largely by his conception of the person of Christ. It is here where he differed most widely from the other Apostles. Paul never knew Christ in the flesh. The chances are that he never saw Him (see II Cor. 5:16). We are certain at least that he never associated enough with Jesus to know Him. His conception of Jesus, therefore, was determined by his vision of Him on the road to Damascus. And there, of course, he saw, not Jesus as He appeared in the flesh, but the glorified Christ.

The idea impressed upon him in that vision was, not the humanity but the divinity of Christ. With Paul, therefore, one of the prominent ideas of his Gospel was the divinity and pre-existence of Christ. We can see the influence of this predominant thought in the titles of Jesus he used. There were three titles which had been commonly used of Jesus in the earliest Christian community. They were, Messiah, Son of Man, and Son of God.

He accepts the title Messiah much in its Jewish sense, and perhaps also for the sake of the Jews. He employs the word in the old eschatological sense, as the Lord of the kingdom of heaven that is at hand. He nowhere attaches any new significance to the word. He himself awaits the advent of the Messiah, earnestly looks forward to the day of the Messiah, and considers all Christians to be living in expectation of Messiah's revelation. Thus he at times speaks of the Messiah. But the Jesus that is yet to come is of less importance to him than the Jesus who has come already. We find him more looking back to the Christ that was and is than to the Christ that is to be. So that the Messianic title had no special weight with Paul, neither did it play a prominent part in his theology. Besides, the word Christ which was the Greek word for Messiah had but little meaning to the Greeks, and so he introduced two Greek titles instead: Lord and Savior. These terms, perhaps contrary to Paul's intention, came to be the means of separating Jesus altogether from the Messianic picture and of bringing Him nearer to the dignity of the Godhead.

The second title, Son of Man, Paul abandoned. It conveyed too much the idea of mere human descent. Paul was exceedingly careful to make the divinity of Jesus as prominent as possible and so he refrained from using titles of Jesus that would tend to detract from the idea of His divinity. Hence Son of Man is seldom, if ever used by Paul as a title of Jesus. Of course he does speak of him at times as a man. And as a man he compares Him with the father of men—

Adam. He speaks of Him as the father of a new race. But even as a man Christ was the Son of God. He was the one who preëxisted His earthly stage. He was a man who had come forth as the result of God's emptying Himself. So with Paul the divinity of Christ was in mind even when he speaks of His humanity.

The other title in use in early Christianity was the Son of God. This was rich in meaning for St. Paul as well as for his Greek disciples. The Son of God with Paul is a heavenly being who has been with God from before the ages. He is more than man, for He became man. This fact of His being more than man was settled for Paul in the vision he had of Jesus. As he here saw Jesus as a heavenly being in glory, so he had to picture Him as existing from the beginning of time. The Jesus of Paul was the Son of God who had coexisted with God from the very beginning.

"By means of his vision," says Wernle, "St. Paul became the creator of a new Christology." And the predominant feature of that vision was the glorified divine Lord. The conception of the preëxistent glorified divine Lord thus became the center of this new Christology.

THE CRUCIFIXION.

When we come to Paul's conception of the death and resurrection of Christ we come to something that is peculiar to him. Stevens says with reference to the crucifixion of Jesus, "The Apostle Paul was, so far as we know, the first man who grappled boldly with this problem and sought to prove that the death of Jesus on the cross was the culmination of His saving work and the crowning glory of His Messianic vocation" (p. 403, *The Theology of the New Test*). Those of the Apostles before the time of Paul's apostleship who were confronted with this problem of explaining the crucifixion could do no better than prove from the Old Testament that such an event was not incoherent with the Jewish conception of the Messiah. About all that the earliest of the Apostles tried to

prove was the Messiahship of Jesus. If, therefore, they could show from the Scriptures that the death of Jesus as it actually took place had been foretold by the Prophets and that it was not inconsistent with God's idea of the Messiah they thought they had done all that was required of them. And they succeeded in doing this fairly well.

But Paul took a different view of the matter. His explanation of the crucifixion of Jesus was more than apologetic. He found room for the crucifixion in his theory of salvation. Indeed it became for him the heart and center of his theology. We have said that Paul's Christianity and his theology have their source in his vision of the risen Lord. After Paul had that vision he could think of nothing that had happened to Jesus during His life on earth that had not in it an element of the divine. So even that most shameful and accursed death on the cross appeared to him as something divine. By the sacrifice on the cross God's message of love and grace was conveyed to man. And through this love and grace Paul became assured of the pardon of his sins and of the blessedness of a new life. This was a real personal experience with him. "Henceforth," says Wernle, "it is for him the fixed center round which all history turns, the source of all comfort, of all peace with God. St. Paul sees the motto 'God for us' written in great letters over the cross" (p. 238).

Men before Paul's deliverance on the significance of the cross had found value in the death of Jesus. They thought of it as a punishment, but not a punishment for Jesus' sin, as the Jews claimed, but a punishment for the guilt of the Jewish people. It came to be a Gospel message that Jesus died for the sins of those that repent and set their hopes upon His death. This conception Paul practically accepted. But he added a great deal to it. His additions were mainly the conception of sacrifice, propitiation, redemption and reconciliation. But in all these conceptions the predominant feature was the love of God. So we may well say that Paul's addition to the interpretation of the crucifixion of Jesus was that it was an expression of the love of God.

THE RESURRECTION.

Linked with the crucifixion is the resurrection. This event in the career of Jesus was made much of by all His followers. It gave the disciples who were brought to despair by the death of Jesus new hope and courage. In the resurrection they saw the vindication of their Leader. It was to them perhaps the most significant event in His entire history. At least they made much of it in their preaching. The one theme that was sure to be a part of their message was the resurrection of Him who had been crucified. They taught also that this resurrection of Jesus was a sure pledge of their own resurrection in the last day. So we cannot claim for Paul the distinction of originating the New Testament doctrine of the resurrection. Others had made a noble beginning before he came upon the scene.

And yet we find some originality in Paul's theory of the resurrection of Jesus and its significance to mankind. While it is true that others had regarded the resurrection of Jesus as a pledge of the resurrection of the rest of mankind, it was Paul who brought that resurrection from the distant future to the immediate present. Paul saw in that vision which brought about his conversion the risen glorified Lord. He was impressed with the absence of flesh and sin and all else that belongs to man's lower nature and the presence of an effulgence of Spirit and life. This vision helped to form Paul's ideal, and he believed that this ideal in part at least could be reached in this life. To reach this ideal meant of course to get rid of the flesh, sin and death, and to get filled with the Spirit and life. The resurrection of Jesus was to Paul symbolical of the birth of this new life. Just as the death of Jesus was followed by His resurrection and life, so in the Christian there can be a death of the old man and the birth of the new. The resurrection, therefore, has a meaning for the present life. It carries with it the thought that the power of death, sin, the flesh, the descent from Adam was at an end. The old world was passing away, a new world was at hand.

Here Paul is in harmony with the teaching of Jesus in so far at least as Jesus represented the Kingdom of heaven as being at hand. Jesus' idea of the Kingdom being in the hearts of men and enjoyed by them in this life, and Paul's idea of this new world and new life have much in common. They differ, however, in their views as to the source of this new life which is common to both. Jesus bases the presence of the Kingdom on His presence in the world. Paul bases this new life largely on the resurrection of Jesus. The one laid stress upon the character, teaching and life of Jesus; the other on a single event. Paul possibly exaggerated the value of Jesus' resurrection. Wernle says, "It was a misfortune for the new religion, and in contradiction with the progressive spirit of Jesus, that the one miracle in the past thereby became the foundation for Christianity" (p. 246, Vol. I.).

THE BELIEVER'S RELATION TO CHRIST.

Having considered Paul's views concerning the person of Christ and the two outstanding events connected with that person, namely, the crucifixion and the resurrection, we shall next consider Paul's views of the Believer's Relation to Christ. It took Paul a long time to get clear on this point. It is generally assumed that the three years in Arabia were spent in meditation and study with a view of getting into the clear as to his own relation to the Lord whom he had seen while on his way to Damascus. If that was the burden of Paul's work during that period we may regard those three years as well spent. For Paul presents a beautiful and comforting theory concerning the believer's relation to Christ.

Perhaps the controlling idea in his theory of the true relation between Christ and the believer is expressed in the phrase, "the life of Christ in the believer." McGiffert says that the Gospel of Paul as presented in his letter to the Romans is "the Gospel of the divine life in man" (p. 329). This Gospel Paul preached not only to the Romans but wherever he went. It was the Gospel in which he himself found the greatest com-

fort. It satisfied his own longings. He felt that he enjoyed the possession of this divine life. He does not hesitate to say, "It is no longer I that live, but Christ liveth in me" (Gal. 2:20). This oneness with Christ was for Paul no mere figure of speech, it was an actuality. He was one with Christ the second Adam just as truly as his fleshly nature was one with the first Adam. And this oneness with Christ gave Paul the assurance of salvation, which meant for him deliverance from sin and the flesh, freedom from the law, and life eternal.

It assured him of salvation because it helped him to be delivered from sin and the flesh. The flesh with Paul was sinful. How could he overpower it? Not by his own will—that was too weak. But the Christ within him has power to control the flesh. And he is under the control of the Christ and so long as this is the case the flesh is powerless. It is only as the divine Spirit is neglected, as the Christ in him is driven out that sin and the flesh can come into control. The true believer who has died unto the flesh and has been raised with Christ unto a new life must therefore see to it that he allows this Christ in him to be in control. Paul exhorts his readers to keep their bodies in subjection, to walk in the spirit, and to strengthen themselves with might by His Spirit in the inner man. In so doing will they be freed from the bondage of sin and the flesh.

This oneness with Christ also assures Paul of freedom from the Law. Law exists only where there is sin. And sin with Paul was attached to the flesh. Christ lived under the Law while He lived in the flesh. But He died unto the flesh and thus was discharged from the Law. In the new life of the Spirit in which Christ lived after death He was no longer subject to the Law. So every believer who dies unto the flesh with Christ and with Him is born into the life of the Spirit is thereby discharged from the Law. He who is one with Christ is free from the Law, for Christ is free from it. Upon this freedom from the Law Paul unequivocally insists. The Law

is in effect only for those who are living unto the flesh, and for them its purpose is to convict them of sin. As soon as the Law has accomplished that and the penitent sinner has accepted and become one with Christ the strength of the Law is gone.

This oneness with Christ also assures Paul of eternal life. According to Paul eternal life begins in dying unto the flesh and receiving the new life in the Spirit. After this has taken place there can be no more death for the believer. That which is called death is the death, not of the man himself, but of his flesh. The believer himself who has become one with Christ continues to live through eternity.

After the believer has been freed from his bondage to the flesh he is, of course, in need of a body. So Paul conceives the idea of a spiritual body. This spiritual body is not the former body purified. It is a body of an entire different nature. "It is distinguished from the old fleshly body just as sharply as the new spiritual life is distinguished from the old fleshly life. The resurrection of one's body, therefore, is simply the natural sequence of one's resurrection with Christ to the new life in the Spirit here on earth. Those who have already risen here in the spirit shall rise again after the death of their present bodies in a new spiritual body, by its very nature holy and immortal, and thus fitted for the new spiritual and eternal life" (McG., p. 135).

It will be seen that in all these theories growing out of the idea of the believer's oneness with Christ Paul makes much use of the contrast between the flesh and the spirit, law and gospel, death and life. He was the first to bring into prominence these contrasts.

Having seen Paul's view on the believer's relation to Christ, the next question that presents itself is, How can this relation, this oneness with Christ be attained and maintained? In other words, what are the means whereby a person may become one with Christ?

FAITH.

The one means without which there can be no union with Christ is faith. Paul is the great apostle of faith. His Gospel was the life of God in the soul of man. But this life of God could gain entrance into the soul of man only through faith. It is therefore the first essential to salvation. Faith holding this important position in Paul's system of thought needs to be defined. McGiffert says, "Faith, according to Paul, is the act whereby a man identifies himself with Christ, becomes actually one with Him in nature, and is thus enabled to die and rise again with Him. . . . It is not mere assent, intellectual or moral, it is not mere confidence in Christ's words or in His promises, it is not a mere belief that He is what He claims to be, but it is the reception of Christ himself into the soul. Faith is simply the attitude of receptivity toward Christ" (p. 141). With this definition of faith as conceived by Paul, Wernle agrees. He says, "Faith is nothing else than receptivity for God's love, the suffering oneself to receive the gift, the being seized by God" (p. 301). Where this faith, this attitude of receptivity is missing, there can be no salvation, no uniting with Christ, no receiving of God's love, no forgiveness of sins, no dying unto the flesh, no rising in the new life of the spirit. Faith is, therefore, the indispensable means to obtain the blessings of the Christian religion. It is the "*sine qua non*." "*Extra fidem nulla salus*."

THE CHURCH.

The first requisite for attaining to the ideal relation with Christ is faith. But this faith soon made the Church a necessary means of operation. Paul emphasized justification by faith and the salvation of the believer but he also made the Church a necessary means for the operation of this faith and the gaining of salvation. Paul was not the founder of the Church. The Christian Community had its existence before Paul became a Christian. The Christian Church as a separate and distinct institution came to be such through a grad-

ual process of development. The principles set forth were the seeds from which the Church grew. The growing of these seeds developed first into a sect within the Jewish Church and then into a separate Communion known as the Christian Church. We may safely say that Paul brought about the external rupture between the Christian and the Jewish Church. As a separate and distinct communion the Church dates from St. Paul. But Paul did more than merely effect this separation. He more than any of the Apostles developed the idea of the actual necessity of the Church as a means of salvation. He made the Church and Christ one. The spirit of Christ he confined to the Church. Faith in Christ therefore meant faith in the Church and salvation through faith meant salvation through and in the Church. The Church was for him the body of Christ. And for any one to become one with Christ meant that he must become one with the Church. The Spirit of Christ was confined to the Church, and for any one to have the Spirit of Christ in him necessitated his being a member of the Church. Paul originated the idea expressed later by the words: "*Extra ecclesiam nulla salus.*"

It is true that Paul's teaching is not equally emphatic at all times with regard to the importance of the Church. Indeed it is quite contradictory at times. When he spoke from experience Paul had to teach that salvation did not need to pass through the Church, for he himself gained his apart from the Church. He based his oneness with Christ on experiences quite independent of the Church. He won his peculiar relation to Christ not through the Church, but through individual experiences, such as his vision on the road to Damascus, communion and fellowship with Christ, dying unto the flesh and rising with Him unto the new life of the Spirit. He even boasts that he did not get his Gospel from the lips of the other Apostles but from God himself. The Church, if it had any existence at that time, certainly found its existence in the community of the believers of which Peter, James, and John were the pillars. And yet Paul received his Gospel, his deliv-

erance from sin, his assurance of salvation independently of this community of believers. The Church was not a necessity for him personally. And the privilege that he claimed for himself he could not help but grant unto others. Consequently one finds him speaking at times of faith in Christ independently of the Church as being not only possible but as the only essential.

But his labors among the Gentiles gradually forced upon him the other extreme, namely, salvation through the Church only. In order to impress upon the Gentiles the importance of the Church he went so far as to make it an absolute necessity. He therefore made the saving grace of Christ commensurate with the Christian Church. Christ and the Church he made one. To have faith in Christ must mean to have faith in the Church. To be saved by Christ must mean to be saved through and in the Church. Hence, "*Extra ecclesiam nulla salus.*"

It was here where Paul was beginning to depart from the teaching of Jesus and approaching the teachings of Catholicism of a later century. Jesus came to free his people from institutionalism. Paul here begins to lead his followers back into it. Jesus introduced a simplified and practical religion. Paul sows the seed of a mystic and theoretic religion. The fruit of this sowing ripened in the Catholic Church in the pre-Reformation period. Little did Paul think what he was giving rise to.

THE SACRAMENTS.

The indispensableness of the Christian Church leads to another medium of grace not to be dispensed with, namely, the sacraments. When Paul came to the point where the Church was an absolute necessity as a means of salvation he had to include certain rites of the Church among the essentials; chief among these were baptism and the Lord's Supper. Paul certainly was not the originator of either one of these ceremonies. He found both in the Church when he took hold of Christian

work. He could not throw them out. Neither do we believe that he had any desire so to do. For both sacraments served a good purpose for him, the one as a form of entrance into the Church, the other as a means whereby the believer's relation with Christ was maintained and strengthened.

BAPTISM.

Baptism was first made a sacrament by Paul. The practice of baptizing was in vogue before, but hitherto it had been valued as a sign of membership and a condition of redemption. Paul made it a sacrament by regarding the external act as a means of salvation. It is in his letter to the Romans where he elucidates the fullest upon baptism, and there he uses sacramental language. He would have baptism regarded as a miracle and a mystery. The baptized convert should believe that he steps forth from the water a different person to what he was when he entered it. Baptism was the means of dying with Christ and being raised with Him into the life of the Spirit. It was a necessary means of becoming one with Christ, one with the Church, and a sharer of the redemption brought about by the death of Christ.

THE LORD'S SUPPER.

As baptism was the form of entrance into the Church and the means of becoming one with Christ, so the Lord's Supper became the means of maintaining this oneness with Christ by supplying the participant with the spirit and power of Christ. For Paul taught that the Lord's Supper was no ordinary meal, that it was a meal at which one eats no ordinary bread and drinks no ordinary wine, but partakes of the body and blood of Christ. It was a spiritual food and a spiritual drink, that is, a channel for the conveyance of the powers of salvation.

St. Paul was the first to contrast the Holy food consecrated at the Supper with all other that is profane. In his letter to the Corinthians he goes so far as to claim that the sickness and

death of so many Christians was due to their profane participation in the Holy meal. The bread and wine were given a magical power of feeding the participant with spiritual food. The Lord's Supper thus became a necessary means of salvation. It became a sacrament.

It will be seen that this conception of the Lord's Supper is not in harmony with the rest of Paul's teaching. The predominant and fundamental idea in Paul's idea of salvation is the working of the Spirit of Christ in the believer. But here he attaches a value to the body and blood, that which was perishable in Jesus. In general Paul sought riddance from flesh and blood, but here he makes flesh and blood the handmaids of the Spirit. Why it is that in this case he makes an exception to his general system of thought is difficult to understand. As Wernle says, "The reason probably is that he found here an institution already existing which could only obtain a place in his spiritual doctrine of salvation with extreme difficulty. But he did find a place for it and thereby made it a sacrament. . . . It appears to us at the present day exceedingly strange that the hero of the Word should at the same time have become the creator of the sacrament. He himself, every one who knows anything about St. Paul knows that, needed no ceremonial magic, as the Spirit within him testified to him of God's love and Jesus had set him free from the ceremonies of the Law. But through the reception of the sacrament into his doctrine of redemption he has himself a share in the origin of that Catholicism which made him a saint while at the same time it stamped out his spirit" (p. 274).

Salvation, as Paul conceives it, is in its essence the imparting of divine power. The willingness of God to impart this power is indicated by the sacrificial death of Jesus, the Son of God, which death was a manifestation and a pouring out of God's love for mankind. The reception of this divine power or Spirit will result in a oneness with Christ which will eventually result in the believer's deliverance from flesh and sin,

freedom from the Law, and the gift of eternal life with God the Father. This oneness with Christ is gained through faith in Jesus as the Savior and through the Church as the medium through which the Spirit of Christ operates, having the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper as the principal agencies of bringing the divine power to the individual believer. This in summary is Paul's conception of salvation and the means of obtaining the same. Some of it is in common with the teachings of the Apostles; more of it is in harmony with the teaching of Jesus; a large part of the remainder is peculiar to Paul. There remains now the task of pointing out the fate of this Pauline conception and the influence it had upon the formation of the New Testament and the later Catholic Church.

THE FATE AND INFLUENCE OF PAUL'S CONCEPTION OF CHRISTIANITY.

"St. Paul, the founder of the science of the Church, is the father of the New Testament, although he himself certainly thought of nothing less than that." This statement made by Wernle seems at first thought an exaggeration, if not an untruth, and challenges a thorough investigation. A close study of the history of the formation of the canon, the history of the separate books, and the Pauline thought pervading a large number of them will assure us that there is more truth than fiction in the statement.

Time does not permit us to detail the fate of Paul's views of Christ and salvation and the influence he exerted upon the New Testament writings and the Christian Church at large. It would require a volume to do this thoroughly. But we cannot dismiss this subject without calling attention to the remarkable predominance given to Paul's system of theology in his and later generations. We shall, however, limit the subject to his predominance as manifested in New Testament writings.

The Gospel of Jesus as presented in the Synoptics and the

Gospel of St. Paul were not in strict harmony. The promise of the Kingdom of God and the call to do God's will in order to enter into this Kingdom constitute the Gospel of Jesus. In the Gospel of Paul we have this, "The heavenly Son of God who was crucified for our salvation and rose again, and the way to salvation, faith in the grace of God that was manifested in Him." The two are not in harmony and yet must be brought into harmony if Paul's Gospel is to prevail, as it actually did during the sub-Apostolic period.

We have an effort to bring about this harmony in the writings of St. John. The Gospel according to John is the theology of Paul brought to the time and person of Jesus. Barring several themes occasioned by the circumstances of the times in which the Gospel was written, chief of which are, the favorableness of the Christian religion to the gentile world, especially the Greeks, the hostility between Christianity and Judaism, and opposition to the Gnostics, the main theme of the Gospel is the theology of Paul. However, not all of Paul's theology was taken up by the writer of this Gospel. His Justification theory was no longer relative to the demands of the day. The controversy as to the Law was now dead and buried. Such artificial vocabulary as Law, faith; Law, grace; Law, the Spirit was abandoned by John as it had been by the whole Church of his day. Thus a part of Paul's system of thought found an early grave. But this constituted only a minor part. The major theme lived on and was forcibly and clearly expounded by John.

Thoughts common to both Paul and John are: the radical corruption of mankind; the becoming children and heirs of God through Jesus Christ; the atonement by means of His death; salvation by the Spirit; the means of grace, *i. e.*, the Word, faith, the Church, the sacraments; predestination; the new birth; a double resurrection, and other minor points. Thus it can readily be seen that there is a very close harmony between the systems of thought as found in Paul and John. "The whole of the Johanine theology is a natural development

from the Pauline. It is Paulinism modified to meet the needs of the sub-Apostolic age." John and Paul, therefore, are not two theological factors but one. And if we accept that St. John formed his conception of Christianity either originally or directly from Jesus' teaching we should have to refuse St. Paul all originality, for we should leave him scarcely a single independent thought. But it is St. Paul that is original; St. John is not. In St. Paul's letters we look, as through a window, into the factory where these great thoughts flash forth and are developed; in St. John we see the beginning of their transformation and decay. (Wernle, p. 275, Vol. 2.) This forces us to the conclusion that it is the theology of Paul and not of John we find in the Fourth Gospel.

We accept this, being fully aware that its acceptance is by no means universal. But the admissions of even the most conservative students of the Johanne writings go a good way in granting the validity of the Pauline influence. Stevens in his book, the *Theology of the New Testament*, has this sentence, "The Gospel of John is a distillation of the life and teaching of Jesus from the alembic of the Apostle's own mind" (p. 172). He says again, "It is, therefore, less of the nature of a mere report or chronicle than the Synoptic tradition; it is rather a version, a free rendering, a paraphrase of what Christ had imparted to one who had made His teaching so completely his own that it had become fused and blended with his own thought and life." And if one can admit that the author had "fused and blended" the teaching of Jesus "with his own thought and life" it is easy to admit the rest that that personal "thought and life" with which it was blended was Pauline. It is quite possible for one to believe that the writings of John are strongly Pauline; that they refer the teachings of Paul back to Jesus himself; that their main purpose was to bridge the chasm between Jesus and Paul.

Time forbids us to enter into the Pauline influence of other writings such as Acts, the Pastorals, and I. Peter. Suffice it to say that they show traces of Pauline thought to a large

degree, showing that Paul's Gospel held sway during the period of the writing of the later New Testament books.

In conclusion, what, in brief, may be regarded as Paul's part in early Christianity?

We may safely make the following claims for Paul: He understood the spirit and mission of Jesus better than any other Apostle. He saved Christianity by breaking its narrowness and making it presentable to the Greek and Roman world. He gave it its boldness, undaunted faith, and energy in saving the good seed and pulling out weeds in every new ground. He brought into prominence the divinity and preëxistence of Jesus, the redemptive value of His death, and the significance of His resurrection for life and death. He conceived a comforting and lofty idea of the believer's relation to Christ, being that of the life of Christ in the believer. Hitherto none of the other Apostles had anything like it to offer. His conception of the importance and nature of faith was not only new but noble and practical. He created a distinct and separate Christian Church which was always open to receive new impressions. He made baptism and the Lord's Supper into sacraments by making them essential means of acquiring the power of salvation. He impressed his thought and life so thoroughly upon his age that the literature of that period and the generation following him not only reflected but was actually pregnant with Paulinism. While we cannot claim that all of Paul's views were adhered to by the Christian Church throughout the New Testament and early Catholic period, yet we can claim that the predominant thought of that period was Pauline.

In the face of these claims we are obliged to honor the Apostle Paul by declaring him second only to Jesus in giving Christianity its form, character, and life, and second to none in interpreting God's plan of redemption as revealed in and through the person of Jesus.

EASTON, PA.

VI.

THE MINISTER AND THE NEW THEOLOGY.

PAUL B. RUPP.

The twentieth century is an age of transition, a time for "the removing of those things that are shaken, that those things which are not shaken may remain." In the spirit of sheer independence—and often for no other reason—men are forsaking the intellectual pathways of their forefathers and are marking out their own channels of thought. The dominant characteristic of the times is the untrammelled spirit of investigation, sometimes biassed by old viewpoints, and then again unhampered by any viewpoint whatsoever—but always dealing with subjects which a century ago were beyond the pale of investigation, and thinking and uttering thoughts which formerly it was not lawful for men to speak.

Philosophy, science and political economy are being refashioned after the mind of the twentieth century. Philosophy, for example, has swung like a pendulum from the pure idealism of Hegel to the all-comprehensive, but irresponsible, monism of Haeckel; while in these latter days philosophic theism is coming into her own through the late work of Henri Bergson.

Science, likewise, has undergone a most marvellous transformation, affecting a vital change in the popular conception of both geology and biology.

During the past century scientific research has given the theory of creation a new content, with the result that the earth has come into an unexpected heritage of millions of years, while man himself has discovered to his surprise that he is not

the instantaneous creation of a divine fiat, but that he is the consummation of a long evolutionary process guided by the hand and mind of the Almighty. The telescope of the astronomer has given us a new vision of the universe, so that we are more than ever led to "think God's thoughts after Him." The scientists seem to have created a new heaven and a new earth which, though the same heaven and earth the prophets saw, are in reality endowed with a new significance, because they have been dignified by the presence of the Almighty.

In political theory there has occurred a like change of thought. Monarchies, which twenty years ago were the most absolute, are today working under liberal constitutions; while democracies, which hitherto have enjoyed the greatest autonomy, are becoming still more democratic. For the modern spirit—which is after all the lineal descendant of the Reformation—has overthrown the false notion that all rulers hold their tenure of office by "divine right," and has given rise to the theory that rulers are at all times subject to the will of the people, who, if so inclined, may recall that official who has abused the authority of his office. We have come to believe that the cure for the ills of democracy is more democracy. Thus the modern theory of government is simply the reaffirmation of Abraham Lincoln's celebrated pronouncement.

But political economy, also, is taking on a new complexion under the penetrating rays of the twentieth century light. Industrial abuses which long existed without any unfavorable comment effectively expressed, are now being banished by indignant popular opinion, fostered by a keener appreciation of the Golden Rule. Corporations which years ago were founded upon traffic rebates or upon "simon-pure" robbery, and oppression of labor, are today compelled to believe, whether they will or no, that all business must be built on the "square deal" before it will be allowed to travel its business road unmolested. A few years ago both capital and labor fought out their battles without regard to a third party in the strife.

Today, both are compelled to take into consideration the welfare of the great consuming public when they enter into their warfare. It is of course true that many conditions still exist which are very far from ideal. The sweat shop, child labor, unsanitary factories, workshops with unprotected machinery, disease-laden tenements are still with us, and claim our attention and ingenuity for their removal. But it is also true that certain other conditions and abuses, which time had almost converted into a necessary evil, are rapidly being eliminated under the pressure of the Christian conscience of the day. The complete purification of economic ills cannot be secured in a moment; for the economic millennium, like the spiritual, will come only as the Golden Rule penetrates the thick shell of commercial selfishness and enables the employer to perceive the soul of a fellow-mortal beneath the calloused skin of his employee.

This scientific, political, and economic ferment is simply an indication that man is coming into his own. Protestantism has left its indelible stamp upon modern life. Ancient theories are being studied by the keen eye of reason as never before; whilst authority, whether in science, politics, religion, or what not, must find a more rational foundation than the mere edict of a school, or of a political boss, or of a synod.

And theology, too, has come in for her full share of criticism. She is no longer able to cast her magic spell over the minds of men, as she once was. Under the subtle influence of the spirit of freedom, many of her cathedrals have lost the power of their "dim religious light." While she has long been regarded as the "Queen of all the sciences" she has been stripped of some of her royalty, and has been compelled to submit—just because she is a science—to the same tests to which all sciences are subject. In this investigation of her nature and claims the new school has declared that much of what she insisted upon as vital to her life, is not vital at all, but is only the sickly appendage of Christian theology, the removal of which will restore her to health, and enable her to assume her former primacy among the sciences.

Now the strictures which theology has suffered at the hands of the modern theologian, or rather the resultant changes of interpretation arising from these strictures, have given birth to the term, "the new theology." And yet we must not forget that much of what is called "new" in theological thought, is not purely a product of the twentieth century but is really the intellectual and spiritual fruit of the preceding centuries. Much as we like to give it a character all its own, "new" is more or less a relative term. Its roots are planted deep within the soil of the ages. The "new theology," therefore, is not a theology with a new content, but is an interpretation of the fundamentals of the Christian religion in the light of modern thought, rather than of medieval philosophy. Its starting point is the trite, but eternal, truth that "God is love"; and the scientific principle that God "works all things for good" through an evolutionary process, which, though a process, is, from the biblical point of view, God Himself working in and through nature for the fulfillment of His own gracious purposes.

Now the chief cause of the furore arising in theological circles with the advent of the "new theology," is not the fact that the "new theology" has attempted to give us something fundamentally different from the accepted theology of the church; but this furore has been caused largely by the fact that modern thought has been bold enough to carry its investigations into the sphere of religion, where above all places we had long believed that theories had been fixed beyond the possibility of a change. We hold a distinctive dislike to change. For minds which have long thought in the same channels cannot easily accommodate themselves to new ones, even though the new are grooved in accordance with the prevailing spirit of the times. And especially is this true in theological thought, where revelation has been regarded as ended with the closing of the canon. The current theological interpretation has been in vogue, in the main, for eight hundred years, and more. Men were loath, therefore, to see a system tampered with which has

become hoary with the age of many centuries. And yet, just as "no man can conceive the changes involved in modern science, and not feel how impossible it is for the men of this generation to occupy precisely the same point of view of not more than fifty years ago," so no one can fully appreciate the principle underlying Protestantism without admitting that it confers upon men entire freedom of conscience and freedom of investigation, which, in the nature of the case, forbids an unchangeable point of view. This bequest of Protestantism must be constantly held in mind in our treatment of theological truth; else Protestantism will have delivered us from the stereotyped theology of Romanism only to bind us in the chains of a no less stereotyped form of her own making. Especially is this true at the present time, for there is prevalent in and outside of the church a feeling which finds it difficult to accept the old dogmatic statements of the church unqualifiedly; at the same time there are many perfectly honest men and women who find themselves utterly estranged from the church because of her insistence upon a dogmatic system which is not only out of harmony with the spirit of the day, but which in fact contradicts some of the most fundamental ethical conceptions of the twentieth century. The most appropriate thing for the theologian to do, then, is not to raise an outcry against the assumed decadence of religious feeling, nor attempt to change the dissenter's conscience, but to try to appreciate the viewpoint of the twentieth century, and bring the dogmatic standards of the church into some kind of harmony with the highest ethical thought of the day. And theology need not be fearful of the result. If her system is based upon the truth it will come out of the ordeal unscathed. If, however, it contains elements which are not able to bear the light of a searching investigation, then criticism will have done theology a service in helping to free her of her most objectionable features. The theologian need not fear the truth, however much it may cause him to revise his pet theories; for his province is not to bolster up a certain theory, but to seek the *truth*, regardless of any

cost to his system. While his spirit and temper, in this search for the truth, may be revolutionary and critical, they must be so only for the sake of reconstruction. And this reconstruction is the aim of the sanest and most temperate of the "new theologians."

Now, everyone believes that the facts which underly science today are the same eternal facts which underlay science two hundred years ago; but the new science has thrown an hundred-fold more light upon these facts than our forefathers would have believed possible. Protoplasm, cells and tissues were as much part and parcel of Adam and Eve as they are of men and women today; but the modern biologist understands their structure and relationships in a way which would have been utterly meaningless to the man of the primitive garden. The planets and comets and nebulae doubtless shed their light upon the stargazers of Chaldea as they do upon the modern astronomer; but the latter knows more about the visible heavens than the wise men ever dreamed of. Likewise the facts of *religion* are just the same today as they were in St. Paul's or Christ's day. Sin and repentance, sorrow and suffering, God and the Holy Spirit, revelation and inspiration, are just as vital to the Christian life today as they were in the palmiest days of Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, Calvin, Wesley, or Jonathan Edwards. But just because theology is not a fixed quantity of truth, but a progressive science,—which ever widens out its borders with the advent of each new year—we believe that we are in a better position to "think God's thoughts after Him" and to interpret these eternal facts of religion more correctly, than were the medieval schoolmen. The recent centuries have thrown a flood of light upon these thoughts and these facts which the middle ages did not possess. And thus, while the essential facts of religion remain the same, our comprehension of them and our interpretation of them, change with almost every generation. This change of interpretation during the recent generation is embodied in what is called—for the want of a better name—the "new theology."

Old dogmas, old creeds, and confessions of faith have all been examined in recent years in the light of scientific research and modern theological thought; have been critically compared with the teachings of Jesus and the Apostles, "have been put into the crucible of reason and revelation, and the result has been a restatement of the cardinal doctrines of the church"; but the cardinal *facts of religion* have not suffered the loss of one jot or one tittle of their eternal truth. God, Jesus, the Holy Spirit, Scriptures, Redemption, are still the primal facts of the Christian faith against which criticism cannot prevail. True, there has been a rearrangement in the order of importance, so that certain doctrines which formerly occupied the front of the stage, have been shifted to the background; but no dogma which is really vital to Christianity has been rejected. On the contrary many ancient truths have been infused with new significance and have been sent on their theological way rejoicing. The Christian doctrine of God, for instance—that "God is love"—had been practically shelved throughout the centuries by another doctrine which is the fruit of medieval speculation and Jewish theology: to wit, that "God is justice"—a view which Anselm so ably, but still so incorrectly, voiced in his celebrated work, *Cur Deus Homo*. Now modern thought demands that all theology shall revolve around the basal thesis that "God is love," and that all our dogmas must inevitably square with this fact, or rather with our ripest conception of God's love, before they will find a legitimate place in our theology.

It is just here, in our conception of God, in which the "new theology" differs from the old. In these latter days it is almost a truism to declare that theology must be Christo-centric—that the Christian doctrine of God must square with what *Jesus* taught about God, for the Christ is "the express image of His person and the very effulgence of His glory." (That such has not really been the case is evidenced by the fact that the latest book on the doctrine of God is entitled *The Christian Doctrine of God*, by Clarke, of Colgate.) Until about 1850

the church preached a God who differed so essentially from the Father whom Jesus knew, that He seemed almost repulsive to the man of twentieth century culture. And so patent has been the contrast between the God of Jesus and the God of dogma that the voice of protest finds expression in the mouth of "Waldo" in the *Story of an African Farm*: "I love Jesus Christ, but I hate God."

While it is of course true that theology since the Reformation has affirmed its belief in the love of God—for the principle of "Justification by faith" could not possibly find any other basis—yet during the past 400 years the attribute of justice really usurped the primacy in His nature, with the result that most of our official theology is rooted and grounded in this secondary attribute of justice, rather than in love. Thus, for example, our theory of life, as a brief probation, the substitutionary theory of the atonement, eternal punishment, and others, find their starting point in the idea that God is fundamentally a *just* God, rather than a *loving Father*,—that His justice must be completely satisfied before His love can begin to dispense its healing power.

We said that our theory of life has been revised in keeping with this biblical conception that God is primarily a loving Father. In years gone by, life was regarded as a probation which ends at the grave. If men had hungered and thirsted after righteousness, they forthwith went to heaven; but if evil had been the constant bent of their mind and heart, they were immediately consigned to all the terrors and torments of the damned. The grave put an absolute quietus upon any further chance of reformation. But suppose we interpret life in terms of God's Fatherhood; then our "three score years and ten" will seem to be altogether too brief a period to constitute the foundation for eternity. The human personality, like matter, is subject to development, a development which begins here, but which continues on, even after the personality has passed beyond the grave. Shall we consider death, then, as the end of the probationary period, or only a point, an incident, in the

career of the personality? It is natural for us to believe that God offers men every inducement in His power for them to "repent of their evil ways and live." His grace is boundless, we say. How then can we conceive an end to that grace? Is death such a peculiar and mysterious thing that it is able to work a change in the unchangeable character of God so that His mercy and love are finally exhausted, and hate and anger now form the constituent elements of His character? On the contrary, we sometimes feel that the parables of the "lost coin," the "lost sheep," and the "prodigal son" hold out at least the hope of an unlimited grace to which death can put no end. In other words we are inclined to think that a second probation—and here we are of course entering the field of pure speculation, not strict theology—or rather an eternal opportunity for repentance and salvation, are more in line with the spirit of scripture and the divine Fatherhood, than the teaching that death forever ends man's chances of reformation. Of course we realize that character has the tendency to become fixed as the individual grows older, so that the chronic reprobate would seem to have forfeited all chances of any further hope, as far as his salvation is concerned. And yet we have evidences of a new birth even after the individual had gone down to what we believed was the lowest depth of degradation. Harold Begbie plainly illustrates the possibility of reformation in the life of the most hardened character, in his fascinating book, *Twice-born Men*. And the question which naturally arises is concerned with the period of time during which reformation is possible. There is a statement in 1 Peter 3:18-20 which seems to bear out the argument that probation extends even beyond the grave. St. Peter declares that Christ was "put to death in the flesh, but made alive in the spirit; in which also He went and preached unto the spirits in prison, who aforetime were disobedient, when the long suffering of God waited in the days of Noah." Now the "spirits in prison" were those who died unconverted in the days of Noah, and were then in Gehenna. Then arises the question: Why should

Christ preach the Gospel, or glad tidings, to the "spirits in prison" if there was not the possibility for them to repent and be saved? If they were hopelessly doomed, then Christ's preaching to them was mere mockery. In the next paragraph, 4:6, St. Peter says "unto this end was the Gospel preached even unto the dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit." It is only allegorical exegesis which is able to make this mean anything else than that God gave the depraved contemporaries of Noah a second chance to repent and be saved. This does not, of course, imply that they embraced the opportunity, but that they were given the chance to do so. And this is not Universalism; it is simply the strong hope which results from a devout faith in the mercy and goodness of the divine Father.

At this point we must not fail to note the difference between those who die in the darkness of paganism and those who "breathe their last" amidst the culture and spiritual opportunities of a Christian civilization. We can hardly believe that God consigns to perdition those who are of the former class. The old missionary dynamic, that we must save from the fires of hell as many heathen as we can snatch away before they die, has lost its meaning for the twentieth century. We simply cannot refrain from believing that God will give them another chance. But will He give the second class a like chance? That is another question. We hope so. And beyond that we cannot dogmatize.

But this view of an unlimited probation will of necessity affect a corresponding change in our conception of punishment. Our theory of eternal punishment rests upon the theory of life as a limited probation, and upon the legal procedure of the Middle Ages. The unrepentant sinner continually resists God's laws and constantly violates His justice. The sinner's case calls for necessary punishment. But in the Middle Ages crime was judged according to the *rank of the person against whom the crime was committed*. Stealing from the nobility was of more serious consequence, and was punished more

severely, than was the same crime committed against the person of a peasant. Now this idea carried over into theology—as it was by Anselm—declared that a sin against God calls for eternal punishment, because it is committed against an infinite and eternal person. But suppose we shift the emphasis from justice to love, and totally eliminate the medieval view of crime—as our common law has done centuries ago—for we believe that stealing is stealing, whether from king or peasant—then eternal punishment will “go by the board,” or at least will be modified in its scope, while punishment *per se* will be compelled to find a new basis. And this, we believe, will be God’s loving purpose to purify the human will by the power of His infinite Spirit. Reformation of the sinner will then, be the keynote of punishment while all that will remain of eternal punishment will rest, not upon God’s inflexible wrath or inviolate justice, but upon man’s will. Punishment will last just as long as man wills to sin, and no longer. If Jesus was on theologically safe ground when he abrogated the ancient teaching that “an eye must be exchanged for an eye and a tooth for a tooth,” and in place of a *quid pro quo* substituted the law of love—“love your enemies”—then we are on just as safe ground when we declare that that is the course which God Himself pursues in His treatment of the individual sinner. Thus we believe that while he punishes all wrongdoing, He does so, not because He hates, but because He loves the sinner, and desires to cleanse him of his sin. Probation will be therefore lengthened by the divine love. Otherwise the Almighty would be a vindictive God of wrath—just what revelation says He is not—whose patience is finally exhausted by a sin so serious and by a character so evil that the only possible remedy is a punishment which will last forever. But if that is the case then everlasting sin must be coincident with eternal punishment, so that, side by side with the kingdom of the good, there must of necessity be an eternal kingdom of evil. But this constitutes a bald dualism in theological science which the churchman dare not, in the nature of the case, grant.

However, in connection with our revised theory of life and punishment, we are compelled in the next place to modify our interpretation of the Atonement. The official theory, that the death of Jesus was a *substituted punishment* for the sins of man, is the logical deduction from the two preceding theories. According to Anselm, who is the father of the current view, man committed an infinite sin in that he sinned against God who is an infinite being. This sin, as we stated above, calls for an infinite or an eternal punishment. But since man is a finite being and unable therefore to bear such punishment (though we are not able to see just how a finite being can commit an infinite sin), he is unable to render to God what is His due. So Jesus, the theanthropic man, bears this punishment in man's stead.

Now it seems that our ideas of the character and nature of God are altogether anthropomorphic; we attribute to Him the thoughts and feelings which the saintliest men reveal. Our idea of his love is arrived at by our perception of the pure and self-sacrificing love of any father for his children. His justice we have conceived from our courts of law, only infinitely higher and absolutely impartial; and we believe that we dare not impute to Him any quality or characteristic which would not be consistent with the highest conceivable type of ethical character. He must be at least as loving and as just as the best men would be. And yet here is a theory of the Atonement which contradicts even the imperfect conceptions of human love and human justice. We are imputing to the most high God thoughts and feelings of which not even demi-gods would be guilty, for God would be neither a just Ruler nor a loving Father, were He to punish the innocent in place of the guilty. Not even our common law, imperfect as it is, would for a moment countenance such a procedure. The theory of a substitutionary atonement, or substitutionary punishment, involves the imputation of man's sin and guilt to the Christ, and thus gives him a character which revelation affirms he did not possess. Punishment presupposes a previous transgression.

But Jesus was without sin. Scripture is plain on that point. How then could he in justice be called upon to bear man's punishment?—for we believe that the *guilty* alone must suffer the penalty for his transgression. Any other method of punishment would do violence to our highest moral concepts. In our theological thinking we must constantly guard against permitting a syllogism to end in a conclusion which contradicts the deepest feelings of the heart. Otherwise, we shall simply repeat the sad experience of John Calvin, whose heart compelled him to confess that his pet theory of predestination was only a "horrible decree"—though syllogistically sound. John Calvin was a Christian in spite of his theology. When our theories end in a conclusion at which our conscience and hearts revolt, then, in order to avoid the experience of Calvin, we must be willing to go back to the beginning of the theory and revise our premises, if necessary. This the "new theology" attempts to do with the substitutionary theory of the Atonement; and in the place of justice it would substitute *love*; for the norm of any theory of the Atonement must inevitably be that which John gives us in 3:16, and which he declares is the supreme motive which prompted the sacrifice.

Now it must be remembered that the "new theology" does not reject the *fact* of the Atonement; it simply rejects the current interpretation. But at the same time it agrees with Dean Farrar that "any attempt to explain the *exact* nature and method of the transcendantly Divine Compassion in the life and suffering of Christ is a futile endeavor to be wise above what is written; to translate the language of emotion into the rigidity of a syllogism, and of rapturous thanksgiving into rigid scholasticism." For the cross of Christ will ever be a mystery to the Christian and a stumbling block to the Jew.

And yet with our sense of the utter inadequacy of language to express the full significance of the atonement the "new theology" dares to lay stress upon the following points, as expressing, at least in some degree, the intent and purpose of the divine transaction: (1) *Jesus' whole life, including the*

incarnation, the resurrection and the ascension must find a place in any theory of the atonement which the church attempts to teach. Not only his *death*, as sufficient to take away sin—and this theory of substitution stresses his death to the neglect of all other features of his life—but his *life* and his *teaching* must form an essential part of the theory. For the fact of the atonement began when he entered into humanity in the incarnation, culminated in his death on the cross and reached its final completion in the resurrection and the ascension. (2) Christ's life was the presentation of the ideal life. He gave us a new ethic, which concerns itself with the will, as well as with the deed. And Jesus lived his ethics, the chief element of which is personal immolation on the altar of humanity, complete self-sacrifice for humankind's welfare. (3) The sacrifice of Christ was not substituted punishment, but vicarious sacrifice, and an actual giving of divine life to men; through faith in him, as our personal Saviour, we enter into a mystical union with him, and assimilate his life and character, so that through him the divine life flows into us and his nature becomes our nature. This is essentially the substance of St. Paul's statement that through faith in him we receive the spirit of "adoption whereby we cry, Abba, Father."

The results of the "new theology" are most patent in its treatment of the Scriptures upon which it has thrown its clearest light. And it is also just here where it has received its bitterest opposition. Men have long regarded the Bible as absolutely infallible in all departments of knowledge. Its deliverances upon history were unassailable, even though archeology and reason disclosed facts fundamentally different from those of tradition. Its pronouncements upon science were stamped with the weight of scientific authority, so that a mighty tempest took place a generation or more ago when Charles Darwin published his celebrated book *The Origin of Species Through Natural Selection*. For ages every part of it was considered equally inerrant, just because its inspiration was deemed like that of the business man who dictates to his

stenographer seated at his elbow. Every part was placed on the same level as of equal weight and authority. The wars of extermination and the murder of defenceless women and children, in Deut. and Judges, the Imprecatory Psalms, the deceits and conceits of the patriarchs, were all regarded as of equal importance, for edification, with the Sermon on the Mount, or the 13th chapter of I Cor. When the modern spirit of investigation, therefore, attempted to approach the scriptures from its second standpoint that "God works all things for good" in a progressive way, and affirmed that the Bible is an intensely human document which shows the progressive manner in which God revealed Himself to men in harmony with their various spiritual capacities, then the new school was charged with destroying the Bible and breaking every commandment in the decalogue. Formerly men regarded both the *message* of revelation and the *written record* by which that message has been transmitted, as infallible in every thought and word and deed. But in the light of recent scientific and historical criticism, the message has been separated from its human form of expression, so that we today are in a better position to understand the theme of divine revelation than were the men of the reformation period; while doubtless what we see and know today only in part will be more fully comprehended by the theologian of the 30th century A. D.

"As the child cannot understand calculus until it has studied the simple elements of mathematics, and thus is gradually brought up to the higher branches as its mind develops, so the knowledge of God could only be given to men gradually, as their religious and thinking faculties were developed to receive such knowledge." This development the "new theology" finds clearly wrought out in the Bible, and accordingly places the various books in a comparative scale of inspiration and importance. It regards the Christ as naturally the complete and final revelation of God, and tests all preceding revelation by His teaching and mind. While we do not find recorded every word and deed which the Christ spoke and did,

we yet believe that the gospel writers have been more or less faithful in their delineation of Christ's character and mind. Now Jesus felt perfectly free to revise the Mosaic code in a manner consistent with *his* knowledge of God's ways and will. And in doing so he has bequeathed us the right to revise, not the code, but both our interpretation of his person (for theology in its strictest sense is after all only an interpretation of God and his ways), and of God's method of revelation and its message. Christianity is what Christ taught. And if we find Moses or David or Isaiah or the modern ecclesiastic teaching something different, then we must feel free to prove their preachments, and to test their orthodoxy, by the Christ's. In rejecting the mechanical-stenographic theory of inspiration, and in regarding the scriptures from the evolutionary standpoint, as the imperfect (because human) record of the progressive manner in which God has revealed Himself and His love to men, the "new theology" has really given us a more intelligent conception of the origin and purpose of the scriptures, and uncovered more of their beauties, than men had hitherto believed possible. Affirming that scripture concerns itself entirely with the presentation of *religious and spiritual truth*, rather than with historical and scientific fact, modern theological thought forever declares a truce with science, and henceforth requests the latter to become an ally in the quest for truth. In the spirit of this alliance, science declares that the world came into existence through an evolutionary process, while theology affirms that it was her God who *initiated, and worked through*, the process. And thus has modern thought removed the unscientific stumbling block in the first chapter of Genesis, and converted enemies into friends. It has rescued the Song of Songs from its position as an allegory of Christ and His church, more or less awkward, and presents it to us as "the glorification of a pure and loyal human love, in a drama of most wondrous beauty." It has removed the large question mark which has always accompanied the Book of Job, and declares that Job is one of the finest dramatic poems ever

penned by the hand of man—a poem which enters into the depths of the most intensely human religious experience. It has converted the Book of Jonah into a divine satire against that hardness of heart which closed the gates of heaven against any people but Jews. The miraculous element of the story is passed over as mere oriental dress, while its broad universality is placed side by side with that of the Christ. As a caustic and trenchant poem upon narrowminded bigotry—which Israel surely needed 25 centuries ago—the Book of Jonah is endowed with more real point than it possessed when it went under the *nom de plume* of authentic history. Historical criticism has removed many a dark shadow which certain Old Testament portions have cast on the character of the Almighty, and has declared that God is what Jesus shows Him to be: a God of love and grace and mercy. It has done away with the idea that everything in the Old Testament is simply a foreshadowing of the twentieth century church and her doctrine, and instead has given us a most illuminating picture of the days in which men were seeking a saviour from sin and a guide unto holiness. It has not, of course, settled every question which naturally arises from the close study of any literature—such as the authorship of the Pentateuch, or of Job, or Daniel, or Hebrews, or where Cain secured his wife, but it has given us at least a more ethical conception of God and a more scientific insight into His methods, than the church formerly possessed.

It is true that many members of the so-called new school are not at all agreed upon all points of exegesis, nor even upon all the theories advanced by the new school, but complete agreement we can never hope to find in any human organization. While this book of revelation has been ushered into the sphere of criticism, it has not suffered the loss of a single book nor a single page. It occupies the same exalted position and merits the same unbiased study as ever. It needs no defense, for it can stand on its own feet. It has indeed been cleared of certain false ideas which men read into the book, but the Bible

itself remains in all its mystery and power. It is to be expected that men will differ in their interpretation of a fact throughout the ages, but the fact itself remains, regardless of these differences in interpretation. And while modern criticism may have gone too far in some of its conclusions, and therefore may have seemed to have destroyed the faith of those whose faith in the first place rested on a very insecure foundation, it has in fact destroyed nothing which is really fundamental in Christianity. If anything, its strictures have created a wider interest in, and a more scientific study of, the groundwork of the Christian religion than had obtained in any period of the church's history, prior to, or since the Reformation. God, Jesus Christ, the Holy Spirit, the Atonement, and Sin remain the eternal facts with which man must deal in the course of his religious life; and while our knowledge of, and interpretation of, these facts change with the fuller intellectual and spiritual revelation of the ages, yet from these facts man cannot escape. He must worship a God; a Saviour his deepest nature calls for; while a divine Spirit—however men differently understand His operation—still acts as the inspirational power for righteousness. Despite the subtle assaults of criticism human life remains unmovable amidst all its divine relationships.

These then are a few of the conclusions to which the "new theology" has come in the course of its investigations. And what shall be the attitude of the modern minister toward these conclusions, or toward any of the problems which modern thought will necessarily raise. It is only trite to declare that the minister who wishes to satisfy the needs of his people must enter into their innermost life. He must interest himself in what interests them. Not only the dangerous conditions under which they earn their livelihood, but also the conditions under which their mental or their spiritual powers are dwarfed or developed, must cause grave concern to the minister who feels his responsibility. All public questions are in the last analysis moral questions, and therefore demand the minister's atten-

tion. Every new political theory, every new social propaganda, and every new philosophical idea calls for his unbiased study,—not, however, because they are *new*, but because at the heart of them there is a moral principle involved, to which the minister dare not prove indifferent, under pain of forfeiting his privilege of spiritual leadership. Even such a grossly secular idea as the tariff involves the moral (or shall we say immoral?) principle of splitting up the universal brotherhood into numberless groups who are all at commercial enmity with one another. The economic and social ills—which socialism thinks she has the monopoly of righting—call for the judgment of the pulpit today, just as surely as these same ills, under different forms, called down upon their heads the condemnation of the church throughout the ages. The minister dare not be too busy, therefore, to interest himself in politics.

In like manner the modern minister must reckon with every new theological idea. His mind must be open to new truth, but he must at the same time be guided and guarded by St. Paul's theory of mental and spiritual growth: "Prove all things, but hold fast to that which is good."

But how can the minister, occupied as he is, by his complicated clerical life, with its constant demands upon his time and energy for pastoral visitation, eternal sermonizing, organization leadership, social functions, and even financial management—how can the modern minister attempt to "prove all things"? How can he in his limited time penetrate to the heart of modern problems and separate the truth from the half truth, or from the downright falsehood? In many cases no attempt is made. His theology has frequently crystallized with his graduation thesis, and thereafter he gives himself up to the routine of his pastoral office. He thinks he has no time for systematic study, and in most instances his sermonic themes, after a few years, lose their legitimate theological basis and degenerate into mere platitudes or exhortations.

But with most ministers there is an honest attempt to face

these problems and to solve them in accordance with present knowledge. True, the average pastor has neither the time nor the resources at his command to initiate an original research into all the subtle points of theology or historical criticism. But he can at least, and the spirit of St. Paul bids him to keep in touch with modern thought by digesting the conclusions of scholars whose whole time is given to their respective researches. In fact the minister cannot really escape from the influences which modern thought sets in motion. And whether he will or no, his thinking is affected either conservatively by the duel of the new with the old, or radically by the general spirit of satisfaction which pervades the air when modern thought reaches a conclusion more ethical than that previously held. But in this all-pervasive theological ferment the busy pastor has one standard by which he can judge the new theory: *the mind of Jesus, as he has come to know that mind by his own personal experience and reason, tempered, of course, by the universal experience and consciousness of the church.* If he is like the man who constantly takes from his treasures things new and old, he will permit neither tradition to warp his judgment, nor other men to do his thinking for him. He will bring all things to the test of both his mind and heart, of revelation and experience, and then will translate the theory in terms of *life as he knows it.* He will not cut loose from the old, simply because it is old, nor will he, without more thought, accept the new, simply because it is new—for neither old age nor youth is a genuine test of truth—but he will prove all things, and then hold fast to that which approves itself to his mind and heart and to the ripest experience of the church.

But what influence will this personal testing of truth have upon his preaching? Will his utterances be like those sensation-mongers who are swayed by every wind of doctrine which chances to blow around the theological corners? On the contrary his pulpit ministry will reveal a deeper earnestness and thoughtfulness than ever, just because he brings all theories

and doctrines to the test of human experience. His themes will still ring with the tone of authority, not however with the external authority of tradition, or councils, or synods, but with the internal authority of a self-authenticated truth which only a prophet possesses. For he will believe not upon the word of another, as did the Samaritans of old, but he will believe because he has seen and heard for himself, and knows that these things are true. His preaching will be dominated by a positive and constructive note, because the truth has passed through the crucible of his heart and been tested by his own life. Since he is an eager learner of truth he has taken to heart St. Paul's advice "that he should take heed lest there should be any one who maketh spoil of you through his philosophy and vain deceit . . . and not after the manner of Christ."

In the course of his study he will sometimes arrive at conclusions quite contrary to the official confessions of his church; and then what is he to do? Shall he say in his public addresses that he no longer believes thus and so, and then attempt by sledge-hammer blows to compel his people to arrive at the same conclusions, and to make them their personal convictions also? Should he attempt with intellectual arrogance to array his knowledge against that of the whole theological world, or against the saintliest experience of the ages? More churches have been rent in twain by such consummate folly as this than by all the petty strife and quarrels which churches seem to be heir to. For preaching which concerns itself entirely with doubts and disbeliefs can bring only confusion and discord in its train. Peace comes only through harmony of man with man. Religious peace can come only through complete harmony of constructive preaching with positive truth. But it must be remembered, at this point, that *fundamental* truths never disrupt, but edify. It is only an over-emphasis upon non-essentials in theology which causes the trouble. Hence when a minister, in whose hands lies the responsibility for the spiritual culture of his people, reaches a conclusion upon a

non-essential which is not in harmony with the accepted theology of his communion, it will prove the part of wisdom not to bring his new conclusion into the pulpit, for the pulpit is no place for the expression of mere negations. And this attitude is not the essence of cowardice, but of real wisdom; for no man's heart is comforted, nor his mind exalted, by hearing his minister deny the possibility of the Virgin Birth, for instance; on the other hand, neither will purity of life nor soundness of character be induced by a public affirmation of such a dogma, for non-essentials have not the power to generate Christian character, and theology no longer claims that Christianity stands or falls with the dogma of the Virgin Birth. A physician could, with just as much propriety, expect to cure a case of mental derangement by expressing to his patient his doubt concerning the efficacy of the Pasteur treatment for hydrophobia, as could the minister expect to heal the broken-hearted and comfort the sorrowing by a dissertation upon the veracity of St. Luke's prologue, or by his public denial of the possibility of all miracles. The "new theology," as previously stated, makes Jesus and his teaching the center and the test of its truths; and the minister who desires to be true to both, will preach Jesus' gospel, rather than a particular theory of his birth or of his atonement. And if he remains true to the gospel he will still have a whole thesaurus of material to afford him sermonic themes.

Doubtless much of the indifference of the virile manhood of the age towards the church, and much of the opposition in recent years to the results of biblical criticism, have come in large part from bad preaching; that is, from preaching upon themes which are not in fact the legitimate subject-matter of preaching. When Jesus told his disciples to go out into the world and make converts to his kingdom, he bade them preach the gospel of the kingdom of God; he said nothing as to the reasonableness of dogma, nothing about "eternal damnation," or "baptism by immersion," or "double predestination," or a "substitutionary atonement," or salvation through a political

party. Nor can the modern disciple be wiser than his master. True, sermons upon such themes may attract the "itching ear" crowd for a while; but the time will inevitably come when such preaching will no longer satisfy, because it lacks the pith and point of the gospel of redemption for which alone humanity is hungry. But he will be the wise and faithful minister, who, believing that the "gospel is still the power of God unto salvation," banishes from his pulpit his doubts and metaphysical speculations or political harangues, and makes it the one place in our intensely feverish society where men may still hear the voice of God speaking to them. For that is really what humanity in all ages craves for—the comfort of the gospel and the consolation of the Heavenly Father's love. As long as men continue to preach their positive belief in the power of the gospel to bring the prodigals back into harmonious relationship with their Father, their voices will penetrate into the innermost recesses of their hearer's hearts, whilst their message will ring with all the authority of the ancient prophets. Speculation and criticism are legitimate in their proper sphere, but that sphere is not the pulpit; for from the pulpit men desire to hear something positive about God's love and mercy, and not man's doubts or intellectual perversity. The minister must continue to think and to read in order to magnify his office, but only the constructive results of his thinking and reading dare he present from the pulpit; and, moreover, results which smack more of the Sermon on the Mount and the Great Commandment, than of Nicæa or Chalcedon. St. Paul won more converts to righteousness when he preached the simple message of the cross of Jesus, than when he attempted, in some degree at least, to cater to the desires, rather than the needs of his hearers, as he did at Athens. The modern minister, likewise, must be what his name implies, the minister of the *gospel*, and not a minister of philosophy and speculation and politics. He must apply his gospel to modern conditions, it is true, else it will return unto the Lord void. Whilst he *may* know what the people of Abraham's day were thinking and

doing, he *must* know what the people of today are thinking and doing, in order that his preaching may find a point of contact with the present. And as he comes to know the spiritual needs of his people, as he enters into their very life, so that he is able to rejoice in their joy, and comfort them in their sorrow, and help bear their burdens, will his pulpit ministrations be purged of doubts and skepticism, and pulsate with the fullness of God's revelation and spiritual power which alone can give men life.

MCKEESPORT, PA.

VII.

CONTEMPORARY SOCIOLOGY.

A. V. HIESTER.

To complete the survey of the utopias of the first half of the nineteenth century, which is rich in ideal schemes of social regeneration beyond any other period of equal extent in the history of the race, and which forms the nexus in the history of social thought between the more violent and radical schemes born of the French Revolution and the scientific socialism of the latter half of the nineteenth century, it remains yet to make brief reference to five names: three Frenchmen, Cabet, Blanc and Proudhon; an Englishman, Owen; and a German, Weitling.

Étienne Cabet (1788-1856) is one of the few utopians who were given the opportunity of reducing their social schemes to actual practice. Though of humble origin, he succeeded in securing an excellent general education which he supplemented by legal and medical studies. An agitator by temperament he took an active part in the Revolution of 1830, and obtained under the government of Louis Philippe the appointment of attorney-general in Corsica. From this position, because of his bitter attacks upon the government, he was summarily dismissed after a brief service. Returning to France he was elected to the Chamber of Deputies in 1831, in which position he continued his attacks upon the government begun in Corsica. The government now resorted to more drastic measures, and condemned him to two years' imprisonment or five years' exile. Cabet chose the latter alternative and went to Brussels. But the Belgian government, fearing possible complications with a powerful neighbor, promptly expelled

him. Then he went to England where he became acquainted with Robert Owen. In England, too, he read More's *Utopia* which completely fascinated him. Under the joint influence of these two, the sixteenth-century social dreamer and the nineteenth-century practical philanthropist, Cabet became a convert to communism.

Returning to France at the close of his period of exile in 1839, Cabet published the following year two important works. The first was a fiercely democratic history of the Revolution of 1789—*Histoire de la Revolution de 1789*—which was written along the same lines and animated by the same bitter spirit as his earlier *Histoire de la Revolution de 1830*. The other was a philosophical and social romance which he called *Voyage en Icarie*. These two works not only quickly won the favor of the more radical class of workingmen of Paris, but together with his journal, *Le Populaire*, and his numerous addresses they attracted the attention and won the adherence of multitudes throughout France, as well as in Switzerland, Spain, Germany, England and other countries. Persecution on the part of Church and State had the effect only of giving still greater vogue to his views.

The *Voyage en Icarie* is a bulky volume of five or six hundred pages, whose popularity is attested by the fact that it passed through many editions. While it has little originality, being little more than an echo, greatly elaborated to be sure, of More's *Utopia*, it is noteworthy because it led to several attempts to establish communism in the New World. It is a description of a previously unknown country, "a second Promised Land, an Eden, an Elysium, a new terrestrial Paradise," not quite so large as England or France, but fully as populous, and much more blessed. The author represents himself as having met in London one Lord William Carisdall, who tells him of this wonder land of Icaria, which he had discovered in the course of his travels, and from whose journal the *Voyage en Icarie* is made up.

In this romance Cabet proposes a communistic organiza-

tion of society, not merely as one among others, but as the only practicable solution of all social problems. At the same time he frankly recognizes that because of the defects of human nature his scheme is not immediately practicable. He therefore allows a transitional period of fifty years, in which the new order of things is to be reached by gradual approaches. To accomplish this transition with the least shock to existing social arrangements he proposes certain intermediary measures: a progressive tax on wealth; the exemption of the poor and all necessities of life from taxation; the gradual disbanding of the army and its employment on public works until it can be disbanded; the establishment of a minimum wage; the immediate expenditure of 500,000,000 francs by the government to provide work and homes for the poor; and an annual expenditure of 100,000,000 francs to educate the rising generation in the principles of communism and encourage marriages among the working classes. Along with these measures of legislation Cabet advocates an active propaganda to convert the world to communism.

At the expiration of the fifty years the Icarian state is to be formally established. In it all industry is managed by the government. All are required to labor in common workshops, men from eighteen to sixty five years of age, and women from seventeen to fifty. The length of the working day for men is seven hours in summer and five in winter; for women four throughout the year. As a general thing young people are free to choose their occupations. The only qualification to this appears when there is a disproportionate number of applicants for any particular kind of work. In such cases competitive examinations determine the selection; and the unsuccessful ones are required to make another choice. But this limitation of industrial freedom is less serious than might be supposed. For dirty and disagreeable work will be performed by machinery. Hence all work will be agreeable, and no one will be lazy. Such a system of industry will insure an abundance of products with a minimum of effort. But the scheme

contemplates something more than a crass materialism. Elegance and beauty are to be encouraged, while the short working day will afford abundant leisure for the enjoyment of works of art and nature. And on the other hand, the principle of equality in distribution, combined with efficiency in production, will make possible to all the enjoyment of every comfort, as well as many luxuries.

As in all communistic schemes uniformity is enforced wherever possible. Houses, farms, shops, villages, communes and provinces are monotonously alike. There is also a uniform dress, with variations for age and sex, and a certain latitude with respect to color.

Woman is given an honorable position. Marriage is encouraged and held sacred. Voluntary celibacy is condemned; concubinage forbidden. Cabet is much concerned for the integrity of the family. Less logical than Plato he imagines that property can be abolished and the family preserved. But he violates his own principle when he provides that the education of the child, which up to the age of five is entrusted absolutely to the mother, is after that age assumed by the state in order that all may be properly indoctrinated in the principles of communism. Cabet's views with respect to marriage and the family won for him a large body of sympathizers among the women of Paris, who encouraged him with kind words and floral gifts.

The government is republican in form. On theoretical grounds alone Cabet prefers a pure democracy, but owing to the large scale on which he conceived his scheme, and to which he believed it would speedily attain if once tried, he is constrained to adopt the principle of representation. So far, however, as circumstances permit, direct legislation is to be employed. But whatever its ultimate form with respect to the question of representative or direct democracy, it will be absolute. Its central dominating principle is equality rather than liberty. In this Cabet is characteristically French. Intellectual freedom will be no more possible than industrial or

political liberty. Science and literature will be encouraged, but only under state auspices. While any one may write books to his heart's content in his moments of leisure, he may not publish anything without official authorization. No journal may be published under private auspices. Only one journal is permitted, and that is official in character.

Cabet differs from most communists in his attitude towards religion. He not only bases his communistic views on what he conceives to have been the character of primitive Christianity, but he wrote a number of books in which he attempts to prove an intimate connection between Christianity and communism. One of these has for its title the words, *Le vrai Christianisme suivant Jesus Christ*, and for its conclusion the sentiment, "Le communisme c'est le christianisme." But despite the pronounced religious tone which characterizes all his writings, Cabet's ideal society is distinctively secular in character.

Louis Blanc (1813-1882), journalist, author and politician, was the least utopian of utopians, and may be said to form the connecting link between utopian and scientific socialism, between the older socialism, which was superstitious and fantastical, and the newer socialism, which is sceptical and practical. In comparison with St. Simon and Fourier he is an eminently practical reformer. He relates his scheme of social renovation to the real objective world, whereas they live and think in an imaginary universe. He recognizes, as they do not, the intimate connection between political and social forces. While they are social reformers only, appealing to religious fervor, brotherly love, self-interest and passionate attraction, and ignoring the existing political machinery as a means of establishing and maintaining a better social order, he denies the possibility of any permanent or adequate reform of society save through the power of the state. The reason why there can be no social reform apart from political agencies lies in the inherent difficulty of emancipating the masses and fitting them for the new order of things. So great is this difficulty that it requires, according to Blanc, nothing less

than the whole force of the state to surmount it. The working classes lack, and have lacked since the Industrial Revolution, the instruments of production. These the state must provide. The working classes are ignorant. The state must educate them. The working classes lack initiative and foresight. The state must organize them into industrial associations, which will ultimately become self-governing and gradually supersede the individual entrepreneur and private capitalist. But before the state can be made able and willing to do this it must be democratized. This demand for a democratic organization of the state in order to a reconstruction of society is one of the most distinctive features of Blanc's scheme.

With his keen practical insight into things Blanc was quick to recognize the defects in the schemes of contemporary social reformers. He saw that St. Simon's scheme would destroy individual liberty, even if it did not crush the state with its multitudinous responsibilities. On the other hand, Fourier's scheme stood self-condemned because it ignored the principle of large-scale production so characteristic of modern industry. Avoiding the intolerable despotism of the one, and the economic impossibility of the other, Blanc offers in his *Organization du Travail*, published in 1840, a full and final solution of the problems of society. Because of its brilliant style, its fervid eloquence, and its democratic spirit, the work enjoyed a wide popularity, passing through no less than ten editions in as many years. This was followed by a number of valuable historical works, in which are reflected more or less clearly Blanc's social views. Three are of the first importance. The first is the *Histoire de Dix Ans*, which covers the decade from 1830 to 1840, and which was completed in 1844 in sixteen volumes. This is not only the most accurate and reliable account of the first half of the reign of Louis Philippe extant, but it exercised a powerful influence upon French contemporary thought and action. It is not too much to say that by holding up to the gaze of the French nation the meanness, narrowness and pettiness of his reign it did more than any

other single thing to bring about the overthrow of Louis Philippe and the establishment of the Second Republic. The other two historical works written by Blanc are the *Histoire de la Revolution Française*, completed in 1862 in twelve volumes; and the *Histoire de la Revolution de 1848*, completed in 1870 in two volumes.

Like most works representative of modern socialism, the *Organization du Travail* is largely made up of denunciations of existing social conditions, in so far at least as they are incompatible with Blanc's social philosophy. The starting point of that philosophy he finds in the purpose of human existence which is defined by the two words, happiness and development. By development he means the perfection of personality, the largest mental, moral and physical growth. Happiness and development determine for each one his wants and needs; and any organization of society to be acceptable or tolerable must make both possible for every single human being.

When Blanc comes to inquire whether the present social order is such as to secure for each one the satisfaction of all his needs, he finds as the answer to his inquiry a decided No. The controlling principle of modern society, he declares, is competition which means a war of all against all. The result is want and misery, undeveloped faculties and unfulfilled destinies. The only remedy for this is a new organization of society, which, abandoning individualism, private property and private competition, the fundamentals of existing society, will be based on fraternity as its all-controlling principle. "Fraternity" says Blanc, "means that we are all common members of one great family; that society, the work of man, ought to be organized on the model of the human body, the work of God; and found the power of governing upon persuasion, upon the voluntary consent of the hearts of the governed."

The abolition of misery through fraternity does not mean a crass materialism, against which Blanc, like Cabet, repeatedly protests. It implies, on the contrary, the most exalted spiritu-

alism, inasmuch as misery cramps the intellect by confining education within narrow limits, sacrifices personal dignity, makes slaves, and engenders crime. To abolish misery, then, is not only a moral duty, but a religious obligation which every man owes to God.

Having determined to his satisfaction the end of society, which is to abolish misery and secure to each one happiness and development, Blanc addresses himself to the means of attaining that end, and proposes as the sovereign remedy for the ills of society the establishment by the state of social workshops, *ateliers sociaux*, which when once established will gradually replace individual *ateliers*. Blanc recognizes, as Fourier does not, the significance and necessity of large-scale production. But large-scale production means for him only large capital, not the large capitalist. It is only from the latter, he contends, that the evils of competition have proceeded.

These social workshops are to be inaugurated by the state, which will advance the necessary capital without interest, enact laws for their government, and for the first year regulate the "hierarchy of functions" by assigning to each one his place in the industrial order. But once set in motion, the scheme will maintain itself by its own inherent energy and power of direction. It will be self-supporting, self-acting, self-directing and self-extending. In each industry the workers will choose their own directors and managers, determine the division of the profits, make good the losses, and provide for the growth and extension of the system. After the initial year the role of the government will be limited to the regulation of the relations between the various industries. In its ultimate form, therefore, the scheme is based on the principle of voluntary coöperation, by virtue of which the intolerable tyranny inseparable from St. Simon's scheme and the misery and anarchy born of the competitive system are alike avoided.

The scheme, once inaugurated through the establishment of a number of coöperative associations, with the aid of the state, in each of the principal fields of industry, will in the course of

time become universal. For owing to certain manifest advantages the public *atelier* will more than hold its own in competition with the private shop, and in a comparatively short time drive the private capitalist out of business. One of these advantages is to be found in the fact that the major part of the capital of the social workshop will be provided gratuitously by the state, which will repay the loans contracted for this purpose, and meet the interest charge upon them, from a general tax supplemented by revenues derived from the management of railroads, mines, insurance, banking and other public undertakings. By means of this device the private capitalist is in effect required to assist in forging the weapons which are to be used against himself in the industrial struggle. That part of the capital of the social workshops which is not furnished by the state will be obtained, first, from the net profits, and secondly, from private capitalists, who may be persuaded or coerced into joining these associations, and who will be allowed the customary rate of interest on such capital as they may bring with them.

A second advantage accruing to the social workshop is its large-scale system of production combined with the spirit of fraternity, which is the controlling principle of the whole system, and which Blanc regards as the most powerful of all stimuli to industrial activity. A third advantage follows from the combining of all the social workshops in a vast federation, which is in effect a mutual insurance company, and by virtue of which the losses of one will be made good from the profits of others.

Because of these advantages the private capitalist will find himself less and less able to meet the competition of the social workshop. And furthermore, with the growth of the system and the consequent increase of collective capital, his opportunities for placing his own capital will suffer material diminution. It is important, however, to note that there will be no sudden ruin for the private capitalist; only a slow but sure defeat.

With the elimination of the private capitalist in a particular industry all competition will cease within that industry. This solidarity of interest among the workers of one industry will be followed ultimately by a similar solidarity of interest among the workers in all fields of industry. Thus, through the progressive operation of the principle of competition, competition will gradually cease everywhere. And with the complete disappearance of competition the socialist state will have been born. To render the new order of things more acceptable to the capitalist class, who are to be destroyed, Blanc is at great pains to convince them that the change will be for their good, as well as for the good of the working classes. He assures them that they will then enjoy safety, tranquility and the satisfaction of observing universal happiness, instead of being harassed by all sorts of dangers and anxieties, born of individualism and private competition, as is now the case.

Let it be supposed now that social workshops have been universally established. What principle, it may be asked, is to determine the apportionment of the various offices and functions within a particular group? The key to this problem—always a difficult one in schemes of social reconstruction—Blanc finds in his all-controlling principle of fraternity, which requires that however much men may differ in capacity they must use all their powers and faculties for others. Capacity is, therefore, the measure of social obligation; and it follows that each one must be so placed in the industrial order that he can use to the full all his talents. "Man has received of nature," says Blanc, "certain faculties, faculties of loving, of knowing, of acting. But these have by no means been given him that he should exercise them solitarily; they are but the supreme indication of that which each one owes to the society of which he is a member; and this indication each one bears written in his organization in letters of fire. If you are twice as strong as your neighbor, it is a proof that nature has destined you to bear a double burden. If your intelligence is superior, it is a sign that your mission is to scatter

about you more light. Weakness is a creditor of strength; ignorance of learning. The more a man *can* the more he *ought*; and this is the meaning of those beautiful words of the Gospel: 'Whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant.' *Whence the axiom, From every one according to his faculties; that is one's duty.*"

While Blanc agrees with St. Simon in his principle of social obligation, which measures the duty of the individual to society, he differs from him with respect to the principle of social distribution, the principle which determines each one's share of the social income. After assigning one part of the net proceeds of an industry to the support of the aged, the sick and the infirm, and the alleviation of crises, which will be less frequent, however, and less severe than now, and another to the furnishing of the instruments of labor to those who wish to come under the system, Blanc divides the remainder among the workers, not in proportion to services rendered, as St. Simon does, but according to their needs. "All men," he declares, "are not equal in physical force, in intelligence; all have not the same tastes, the same inclinations, the same aptitudes, any more than they have the same visage or the same figure; but it is just, it is in the general interest, it is in conformity with the principle of solidarity established in accordance with the laws of nature, that each one should be placed in a condition to derive the greatest possible advantage from his faculties, in so far as this can be done with due regard to others, and to satisfy as completely as possible, without injuring others, the needs which nature has given him. Thus there is no health and vigor in the human body unless each member receives that which is able to preserve it from pain and to accomplish properly its peculiar function. Equality, then, is only proportionality, and it exists in a true manner only when each one, in accordance with the law written in some shape in his organization by God himself, produces according to his faculties and consumes according to his wants."

But to Blanc, as to so many other social renovators, the *remuneration of labor presents an insurmountable difficulty*. He has no sooner obtained his economic formula, apparently to his satisfaction, which is to govern both the production and the distribution of wealth, than he begins to suspect the justice, as well as the practicability, of its latter half. In the earlier editions of the *Organization du Travail* there is no hint of any other principle of distribution than that of need. Later, however, it appears that this was merely a provisional arrangement, a necessary concession to the "false and anti-social education given to the present generation," which "makes it difficult to find any other motive of emulation and encouragement than a higher salary." This concession he definitely withdrew in 1848 and substituted for the principle of need that of absolute equality. Under a right system of education, he declares, men will no longer need the spur of a higher salary. Honor will be a sufficient inducement to labor. And genius will find its reward in the consciousness of exceptional services rendered to society.

It will be noted that Blanc's scheme, as it has been outlined thus far, is almost exclusively economic in character. It contemplates no radical transformation of political arrangements. It takes government much as it finds it, provided only that it be democratic, but limits its activities to setting in motion the new economic order and establishing certain very general regulations for the government of industry. But Blanc has so much faith in the virtue of the coöperative principle that he confidently expects it to extend its transforming touch to various social interests. "The evident economy and incontestable excellence of the life in common," he asserts, "will give birth to voluntary association for wants and pleasures"; and in this way the better part of Fourier's scheme will be realized.

The statement has been made that Blanc is one of the few utopians whose schemes have been put into actual operation. This is true only in a very limited sense. The test was not a

fair one; and the failure of the attempt argues nothing against the practicability of Blanc's views. Because of his prominence in the Revolution of 1848 and his popularity with the workmen of Paris Blanc became a member of the provisional government which was organized after the fall of Louis Philippe. From this vantage point he urged upon the government various socialistic measures, demanding among other things the creation of a ministry of labor and progress. He failed in this as in other matters, although the government did at his instance go so far as to proclaim the principle of the "droit au travail," or the right of laborers to demand work from the government when unable to find it elsewhere. To discredit Blanc and his views the government finally determined to establish a number of workshops, to be organized, however, in such a way that they could not possibly succeed. Their management was entrusted to one of Blanc's most bitter enemies, who had no faith in the scheme, and who was informed at the outset by the Minister of Public Works that "it was the well-formed intention of the government to try this experiment of the commission of government for laborers; that in itself it could not fail to have good results because it would demonstrate to the laborers the emptiness and falseness of these inapplicable theories, and cause them to perceive the disastrous consequences flowing therefrom for themselves, and would so discredit Louis Blanc in their eyes that he should forever cease to be a danger."

The experiment failed as it was bound to do, and after a trial of four months the shops were closed, Blanc himself joining in the demand for their abolition when he realized the designs of the government. Despite the fact that he was in no wise responsible for the manner in which these shops were conducted, their failure did not fail to discredit him among the workmen of Paris. This emboldened the government to proceed against him on the trumped-up charge of having participated in the uprising of May 15, 1848. The truth of the matter is that instead of participating in that up-

rising he had lost much of his popularity with the working classes by opposing all suggestions of violence and insisting on the maintenance of peace and order. The result of the accusation was that he was driven into exile, going first to Belgium, and then to England, where he remained until the overthrow of Napoleon III in 1870. His subsequent activities, whether literary, journalistic or political, were to a marked degree conservative. His influence was always on the side of order; and to the day of his death he worked and hoped and waited for the realization of his dreams through the normal operation of the established political order.

LANCASTER, PA.

VIII.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT.

THE SUPERNATURAL AND THE NATURAL.

The term "supernatural" has many different shades of meaning. In our loose, popular speech it denotes the extraordinary, that which defies analysis and baffles investigation; and its antonyms are: common, ordinary, usual. In philosophy, Supernaturalism is the name given to a Weltanschauung which maintains the theory of a self-existent Supreme Being, who originated and who now controls the forces of nature. It is the opposite of Naturalism, which reduces the whole cosmic process, whether psychical or physical, to the operation of purely naturalistic forces. In theology, the supernatural and the miraculous are practically identical terms. Theologians have held that the occurrence of miracles is, at once, the clearest proof of the existence of God and the surest demonstration of his unlimited power.

It is evident that the common denominator of these varying conceptions of the supernatural is the idea of a Supreme Being. Supernaturalism, in all its shades of meaning, is a term which includes the idea of God. Whether this faith in the supernatural be the superstition of the primitive man, who refers all "surprises" in nature and history to the activity of benevolent or malevolent deities; or whether it be the scientific conviction of a philosophical theist, who maintains that a rational world requires a rational Being for its ultimate ground; or whether it be the assurance of a Christian theologian, who asserts that the miracles reported in the Bible are well-attested instances of the immediate exercise of divine power,—the major premise of all supernaturalists contains

the term God. Throughout the ages, from primitive times to the modern era, they have believed and contended, as against all purely naturalistic interpretations of the universe, that one of its constituent factors is divine.

And this ancient cleavage still exists. Both supernaturalists and naturalists have their champions and their camp-followers in the twentieth century. Indeed, the strife between these two antagonistic views of the world was never keener, or more universal, than today. It occupies the center of the stage. On both sides the old weapons are refurbished, new ones are constantly being forged, and the din of this battle drowns all other debates. Prof. Peabody, of Harvard, tells the story of a Baptist freshman who sought his advice in great mental distress. This perplexed youth was fully persuaded that infant baptism is unscriptural, and he was equally sound on all other tenets distinctive of Baptists. "But tell me," he said to his solicitous mentor, "is there really a God?" This characteristic anecdote loses its humorous flavor when one observes our age and hears this same anxious query on all sides. The problem has gone far beyond the sacred precincts of cloister and academy, where learned men were wont to discuss it. It has made its belated entry into popular magazines and into summer assemblies. It furnishes plots to dramatists and stories to novelists. And the names of the great leaders in this Kampf um die Weltanschauung, such as Haeckel, Eucken, and Bergson, are household-words throughout the civilized world. Those who keep abreast with the current flood of articles on Bergson will recall the surprise expressed by more than one writer at the intelligent interest in the abstruse philosophy of this brilliant Frenchman manifested by persons of little, or no, scholastic attainments. This widespread interest in a question that touches the bottom fact of the universe is one of the good omens of our time. It tends to disprove the popular lament that, in the luxuriant materialism of our age, men have lost their zest for all questions that do not directly affect their physical welfare. But it tends

likewise to prove that the problem of the supernatural is still far from being settled to the satisfaction of either side.

And it appears, moreover, that in this stirring combat, fraught with such tremendous consequences, one side at least is committing a strategic blunder of sufficient magnitude to retard, if not to jeopardize, the ultimate victory. Formerly, the two contending forces were easily distinguished. A vertical line ran between the hostile camps of supernaturalists and naturalists, and the frontier, on either side, was guarded by doughty champions. From the bulwarks of revelation, the theologians fought shoulder to shoulder, in solid phalanx, against those who in laboratory or lecture-room, with microscope or telescope, sought to dethrone God. But today the theological camp is divided against itself. And this internecine warfare is, to say the least, poor strategy against a united enemy.

We witness a similar spectacle today in the political arena. The line that once ran vertically through our body politic, dividing the millions of voters into democrats and republicans, now cuts horizontally through the ancient parties, quartering the electorate into confused and contending sections. The old labels are still used. But nobody seems to know who is entitled to their rightful use. New issues have arisen and many grave problems cry imperatively for wise statesmanship. But politicians still cling desperately to the old labels. Much time and energy were wasted in the recent political campaign by men of both parties to thrust their erstwhile leaders out of the ranks of orthodox democracy and simon-pure republicanism into the limbo of demagoguery. No sane man enjoyed these hysterical performances. And yet every loyal American, who dips beneath the froth and foam of campaign oratory, realizes that they were symptomatic of a deeper trouble. The fact is that the old labels are no longer descriptive of the parties that bear them. The logic of events has made them delusive misnomers. Even the blunt terms "standpatter" and "insurgent," crudely coined though they be, are more accurate

descriptions of the political tendencies of our day than the traditional party names. It remains for the future to crystallize the pending political issues more clearly and definitely, to realign the confused factions into coherent homogeneous groups, and to coin names that will label them truthfully.

And a precisely similar condition confronts us in the ecclesiastical arena, particularly with reference to the fundamental issue of Supernaturalism. Quite recently the highest judicatories of two of our great denominations were compelled to sit in judgment on certain men of their respective communions who were vigorously accused of injecting the virus of Naturalism into Sunday-school literature, and, through this channel, into the hearts and minds of the young people of the churches. Now it seems unlikely, in the nature of things, that devoted churchmen, who have consecrated their time and talents to the kingdom of God, should be engaged in a surreptitious propaganda for Naturalism,—even as it is improbable that statesmen, with an enviable record of patriotic service, should be masked demagogues. And an examination of this “naturalistic” literature reveals evidences of a sturdy faith in the supernatural on almost every page. The writers of these Sunday School lessons believe in the God of the Christian revelation. They believe in his presence in the world of nature and in the fabric of history, and in his absolute power to rule and control all human and natural forces. REAL naturalists would dub men of such convictions “obsecurantists,” but their own brethren would fain thrust them out of the ranks of the regulars.

Why, then, this persistent effort to stigmatize such men as traitors to the cause of Supernaturalism? Why this unlovely spectacle of ecclesiastical bickering? Why this strategic blunder of dividing the forces within the fortress at a time that calls loudly for united action against a resourceful enemy? Evidently, here also the ancient labels are no longer sufficiently descriptive to serve as party badges. They fit the past, but they do not clearly describe the present issue. The terms

Supernaturalism and Naturalism do not mean today what they meant in the age of Thomas Aquinas. Then they denoted theories of the world that were mutually exclusive, but today they are complementary parts of the unified Christian Weltanschauung. One is tempted to say that just as in the state we need supremely "democratic republicans," *i. e.*, patriots who believe that republican institutions exist, and should be administered, by and for all the people, so in the Church we need "naturalistic supernaturalists," *i. e.*, Christians who believe that God exists in, and has revealed himself through, nature.

When Thomas Aquinas drew his famous distinction between the kingdom of nature and the kingdom of grace, he rendered his Church and his age a service of the highest order. He gave the shackled spirit of man full liberty to explore the realm of nature, and he also established the absolute authority of the Church in the realm of the supernatural. According to the teaching of this great theologian, these two kingdoms of nature and grace were distinct and separate hemispheres of the universe. From eternity God had dwelt in the higher sphere, remote from the world. But, in the interest of man's salvation, he had come miraculously into the lower sphere to reveal his divine will, to achieve our redemption, and to establish the Church as his representative. And then God had again withdrawn his personal presence from the sphere of nature. This ingenious doctrinal system lifted the Catholic Church, for a brief period, upon the very pinnacle of its power. It satisfied the restless intellectual spirit of the age by assigning it a legitimate sphere and an ennobling function. And, at the same time, it averted the dangers that threatened the Church by making it the only door through which men had access to the realm of the supernatural.

But two causes, operating silently through the centuries, have caused this magnificent dogmatic structure of the Angelic Doctor to collapse utterly, *viz.*, science and religion. Its author himself drove the entering wedge of ultimate de-

struction into his theological system when he conceded the human spirit the coveted boon of free investigation. Science, like the ungrateful child of a generous parent, heeded the permission and, straightway, forgot the prohibition. It brooked no barriers to its explorations. And it soon discovered that Aquinas' divided universe was a fiction. With tireless labor it wrested nature's age-long secrets from her jealous clutch. And it heard the same legend whispered by earth, sky, and sea. It found everywhere one vast universe of beauty, law, and order. And then science said to theology, "Your God is nowhere to be found. There is no room for him, and no need of him anywhere. From the tiniest seed to the mightiest sun this universe is controlled by natural law."

But the primary cause of the overthrow of the medieval dualism of Thomas Aquinas must not be sought in science. Theologians reject it not because scientists have proved to them that God is nowhere, but because Jesus Christ has revealed to them that God is everywhere. Since the age of the Reformation men have gone back to the living source of the Christian revelation, and they have found in the Bible, in ancient prophetism and in the gospel of Jesus, the glad assurance that God does not dwell apart and aloof from the world, in transcendent isolation, but in it, as its immanent life. They have learned that his contact and communion with the world which he has made is not casual and sporadic, but organic and permanent. The creator and controller of the universe does not dwell outside its framework. And, therefore, he has no need of breaking into it, as it were, for the purposes of revelation, by violating or suspending or surpassing existing laws. He is constantly and permanently in the created universe. The so-called natural laws are the supernatural modes of his personal presence, and the moral methods of his beneficent administration.

There are still scientists who demolish Thormism, and who imagine that they have annihilated the Christian religion. And there are still Thormists, in Protestantism as well as in

Catholicism, who denounce scientific Naturalism because they think that it is subversive of faith in God. But there is also an ever increasing number of intelligent Christians who recognize that Supernaturalism and Naturalism, so-called, are simply two ways of looking at the same thing, each having its distinctive sphere and its legitimate function, and both being necessary to a full-orbed view of the world. The naturalist sees, as it were, the outside of the universe. He observes and reports facts and phenomena. The supernaturalist sees the inside of the universe. He interprets the observations of science in the light of the Christian revelation. More and more science confesses that the explanation of the riddle of the universe as given by the gospel of Jesus Christ is more rational, and more satisfactory to heart and will, than all the guesses of philosophy. And ever increasingly Christian theology shows its readiness to learn from science what the methods are by which God has made, and is still conducting his universe towards its consummation. To men so minded, whether scientists or theologians, the natural and the supernatural are complementary aspects of ultimate reality. Not distinct and separate spheres, the one above the other, as Thomas Aquinas held, but mutually interpenetrating parts of the whole. Thus, "earth's crammed with heaven and every common bush alive with God." The natural is the supernatural expressed in forms that are tangible and visible. And the supernatural is the natural seen in its spiritual significance.

But does not such a conception of the supernatural border close upon pantheism? It does. It goes close enough to pantheism to apprehend and appropriate from it the profound truth of the immanence of God in the entire sphere of creation, a truth which Christian theology, to its hurt, has sadly neglected. But it differentiates itself clearly and emphatically from pantheism in that it maintains, in full accord with the gospel of Jesus Christ, the personal transcendence of the immanent God, his absolute superiority in being, character, power, and purpose over all other factors in the universe.

Thus the gospel of Jesus Christ remains forever the only adequate source for our conception of the supernatural. Those, who through the Master have come to know the Father, will understand the spiritual significance of the natural. They will know that man and matter, history and nature, yea all things, are throbbing with the presence, the power, and the purpose of that ultimate and absolute divine Being whom Jesus has taught us to know and worship as our Father.

Such men are supernaturalists in the deepest and truest Christian sense of that term. And, we repeat, it is, to say the least, a blundering strategy that seeks to deprive them of their right to that label in an age that sorely needs every man who by voice or pen, with precept or practice, can interpret the universe in terms of its abiding spiritual significance.

THEO. F. HERMAN.

IX.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

The following books have been received. They will be reviewed in subsequent issues of the REVIEW.

THE GOODLY FELLOWSHIP. By Rachel C. Schauffler. New York, The Macmillan Company, 66 Fifth Ave. 1912. Price \$1.25 net.

BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL STUDIES. By the Members of the Faculty of Princeton Theological Seminary. Published in Commemoration of the One Hundredth Anniversary of the Founding of the Seminary. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons. 1912. Price \$3 net.

FROM FREEDOM TO DESPOTISM. By Chas. M. Hollingsworth. Published by the author, Washington, D. C. 1910. Price \$1 net.

A NEW CONSCIENCE AND AN ANCIENT EVIL. By Jane Addams. New York, The Macmillan Company, 66 Fifth Ave. 1912. Price \$1 net.

THE FRIAR OF WITTENBERG. By William Stearns Davis. New York, The Macmillan Company, 66 Fifth Ave. 1912. Price \$1.35 net.

THE RISE OF THE MODERN SPIRIT IN EUROPE. By George S. Butz, Ph.D. Boston, Sherman, French & Company. 1912. Price \$1.25 net.

WENN IHR MICH KENNETET. By Paul Blau. Berlin, Trowitzsch & Sohn. 1912. Price Mark 2.40.

DAS JOHANNESVANGELIUM. By Bernard Weiss. Berlin, Trowitzsch & Sohn. 1912. Price Mark 10.

SHADOWS AND REALITIES. By Albert Gehring. Cleveland, Ohio, Central Publishing House.